UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2487th MEETING: 25 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2487)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Grenada: Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067) ...	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2487th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 25 October 1983, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2487)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Grenada:
   Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Grenada:
Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letters from the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Grenada, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico and Venezuela in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jacobs (Grenada), took a place at the Council table; Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico) and Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

3. The Security Council is meeting in response to requests contained in two letters dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua to the President of the Council. The first is in document S/16067. Members of the Council have received photocopies of the second, which will be distributed as document S/16072 at 0600 hours tomorrow.

4. The Council has before it document S/16068, which contains the text of a letter dated 25 October from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the President of the Council, and document S/16069, which contains the text of a letter dated 25 October from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua to the Council President.

5. Council members have received photocopies of the following communications, which will be distributed as Council documents at 0600 hours tomorrow: two letters dated 25 October from the representative of Saint Lucia, which will be issued under the symbols S/16070 and S/16073, respectively; a letter dated 25 October from the representative of Grenada to the President of the Council, which will be issued as document S/16075; and a letter dated 25 October from the representative of the United States of America to the Council President, which will be issued under the symbol S/16076.

6. The first speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I welcome the fact that you are presiding over our work with the effectiveness and impartiality which have always been your hallmark.

8. I wish to thank the members of the Council for being so kind as to meet the request of the Government of Mexico so that we could take part in this debate, which is of direct concern to the countries of our region. The events that bring this about call to mind painful precedents in the history of the Latin American peoples and come in the wake of conflicts and tensions that severely affect peace and security in Central America and the Caribbean.

9. The Council has been convened in an acute emergency. It would have been desirable for this meeting to have been held before the events that, we regret, actually happened. There are important antecedents of preventive action by the Council which, although they may not always have prevented the rules of the Charter from being violated, have served to alert international public opinion and to guide the subsequent action of this body.

10. We shall continue to stress the need for the Council to take up, in due time, consideration of imminent events which fall within its purview. For about a week things were happening in the southern Caribbean which led one to suppose that there was a threat to the integrity of Grenada. Unfortunately, the Council was in no position to act as early as would have been desirable. We are facing *faits accomplis*. A military force of the United States, supported by Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, has disembarked on the territory of Grenada and begun hostilities against its inhabitants, invoking arguments, both general and particular, which are totally unacceptable.

11. What we have here is a clear violation of the essential norms of international law. This is a flagrant act of aggression against the territorial integrity of a State. It is obvious interference in the internal affairs of another country and a manifest denial of the right of peoples to self-determination.

12. Mexico unreservedly condemns the intervention and the military invasion, which lack any justification. The events to which I refer are unquestionably a violation of the basic principles of the United Nations, in particular Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, where it is set forth that Members shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

13. Under regional agreements, there can be no way to legitimize such events. The charter of the Organization of American States, in article 18, provides that "No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State."

14. No convention or subregional understanding can run counter to those rules. The act of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) only provides for collective defence measures against external aggression, based explicitly on Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides as a requirement for such measures the existence of an armed attack from outside, which clearly is not the case. None of those instruments authorizes, furthermore, the intervention by another State in the internal affairs of the region.

15. The international community has repeatedly appealed to all States to make a positive contribution to a peaceful negotiated settlement to the disputes in Central America and the Caribbean. The efforts made by various Latin American countries to this end must be supported by the cessation of foreign interference and a total prohibition of the threat or use of force.

16. Considering the delicate consequences that these events might have on future developments in the region and on the internal processes of the Latin American countries, we urge the Security Council to take the necessary measures to have foreign troops withdrawn immediately. The people of Grenada alone is allowed freely to decide its form of government, without foreign interference.

17. The events to which we refer are part of a cycle of threats and pressures designed to limit the exercise of national rights by peoples in the region. Appeals to harmony and the promotion of a multi-faceted order which could reconcile and include the processes proper to each Central American nation and each Caribbean nation seem to be less and less heeded by those who seek to impose from without an order suiting their own interests.

18. We are living through a particularly difficult time, when the tendency to use force in the quest for new balances of power is becoming more acute. This is happening because of an alleged fragile nuclear paralysis and takes the form of continual acts of aggression against developing countries which lack the means necessary to provide for their own defence. Should such escalation continue, the enforcement of the Charter of the United Nations as a whole would be left pending. Expectations for independence and progress among the developing countries would be null and void. Collective security would be in disarray everywhere and the possibilities of universal conflagration would be increasingly close.

19. It is essential to put an end to this race for strategic and military domination by the imposition of political models and the dominance of ideological dogmatism. Political reason must be brought to bear, together with a spirit of civilized coexistence; and diplomatic means and the norms of international law must be invoked as invariable guidelines for the conduct of inter-State relations.

20. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Today international public opinion has been shocked by international press dispatches concerning the implementation of previously formulated plans by the United States Administration to invade the small island of Grenada, with the political assistance and the symbolic presence of military forces of other countries in the region, designed to give its action the appearance of legality—legality which it obviously lacks.

21. This is a manifestation of the principles on which United States foreign policy rests. It is an expression of the danger that the concept of "vital interests" of the United States has come to constitute for countries that, for reasons of their own development, have removed themselves from the sphere of United States domination and have become independent nations. But, above all, it is a concrete form of the concept of international legal order that, with the mentality of the present United States Government, takes into account only the security of that country, to whatever degree its leaders, with their idea of morality, wish to take it.

22. Grenada is a State in the international community, a member of the Organization of American States (OAS) and a Member of the United Nations. The fact that it belongs to sub-regional organizations does not in any way detract from or affect its duties and rights under the Charter of the United Nations and other norms of international law. It is not, nor could it be, the purpose of these sub-regional organizations to encourage or facilitate the violation of the principles and norms of international law or to

make distorted and ill-intentioned interpretations of treaties and conventions in force.

23. The President of the United States, in a desperate attempt to give legality to the interventionist military actions against Grenada, has invoked the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, of which Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Monserrat, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines are members. It is unacceptable to invoke or interpret that treaty as allowing for the creation of a situation of intervention in Grenada's internal affairs.

24. It is significant that today the United States is, as President Reagan himself said this morning, basing its invasionist activities on a treaty to which the United States is not a party.

25. It might be worth asking the United States delegation this question: since when, according to the international legal order, has it been lawful for several countries to get together and agree to invade another country with which they are not in a state of war and to which only internal difficulties can be ascribed?

26. Might it not then be logical to think that the recent meeting at which the Central American Defence Council (CONDECA) was reorganized—the meeting held in Guatemala under United States auspices—was the prelude to an invasion of Nicaragua and El Salvador, which could open the way to a prolonged war between the Central Americans and the United States?

27. The United States has called for a meeting of CONDECA this week in Tegucigalpa. The military leaders of Guatemala and Honduras, together with the head of the Southern Command of the United States in Panama, have an appointment in that city at the very moment when thousands of United States soldiers are occupying Honduras and there are 17,000 other troops in the fleet of ships stationed off the coasts of Nicaragua.

28. I revert now to the attempts to justify action that is indefensible from any point of view. Article 14 of the charter of the Organization of American States states: "The right of each State to protect itself and to live its own life does not authorize it to commit unjust acts against another State." We do not understand how the United States Administration can try to evade the real meaning of that rule, set forth in a legal order of which it is a signatory.

29. We maintain that to prevent the State of Grenada and its people from exercising the rights conferred on them by the OAS charter, in article 3, and to prevent them from enjoying the protection of Articles 2 and 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and the protection of other relevant provisions of international law, is obviously unjust; and those who allow the United States to carry out such an interventionist—invasionist act on their behalf share the historic responsibilities flowing from the commission of such an act.

30. Nor can we disregard the risk that all the independent countries of the world run when, against all legal logic, absolutely irrelevant treaties are invoked to support *de facto* situations that constitute infringements of all universally accepted concepts of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, while, on the other hand, agreements and treaties that call for a certain kind of international behaviour are ignored.

31. It is clear that in this case all the pretexts adduced by the United States Administration are inadmissible—that is, the protection of United States citizens on the island, the prevention of greater chaos and helping in the restoration of order, governmental institutions and democracy.

32. Yesterday, President Reagan's spokesman said that United States citizens were not in any danger in Grenada. Furthermore, relatives of the United States citizens resident in Grenada asked the United States President not to take any steps that might put their lives in danger.

33. It would be hard for interventionist troops to avoid eventual chaos and restore order in Grenada when their real purpose is to impose plans for subjection and forms of Government which meet the strategic American interests. We must recall that these are the purposes of the restoration of democracy, "American democracy"; they are the same as those which underlay the American interventions in Guatemala, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Chile and which at present underlie the overt and covert actions being carried out against the State of Nicaragua.

34. In any case there is no possible argument to justify this shameless intervention against a sovereign State. There are means and methods sanctioned by international law of which a State can make use in situations of disputes among two or more States, but none of these contemplate the right of intervention. The United States has available to it a number of legal instruments, treaties and conventions that it could use in a civilized manner to settle the disputes or difficulties in which it considers itself involved.

35. Article IV of the Convention of 23 December 1936, to which the United States is a signatory and by which it is therefore bound, establishes the rights of States in the event of disputes. Perhaps it is not too late to learn lessons applied elsewhere in the world. Article IV states:

> "The high contracting parties further agree that, in the case of a dispute among two or more of them, they will seek settlement in a spirit of mutual respect for their respective rights, being able for this purpose to have recourse to direct diplomatic negotiations or alternative processes of mediation, commissions of inquiry, commissions of conciliation, arbitration courts and courts of justice, according to what is provided for in the treaties to which they are parties. They further agree that, if settlement of the dispute is impossible by diplomatic negotiations and if the States in order to reach a settlement must have recourse to the other procedures provided for in this article, they shall inform the other signatory States of that fact and of the progress of the negotiations."

36. By intervening militarily in Grenada, the United States has also violated the Anti-War Treaty (Non-Aggression and Conciliation),[1] signed at Rio de Janeiro on 10 October 1933, article I of which states:

> "The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that they condemn wars of aggression in their mutual relations or against other States and that the settlement of disputes and controversies shall be effected solely through the peaceful means established by International Law."

Article III of the same Treaty of Non-Aggression and Conciliation, to which the United States is a party and by which it is therefore bound, reads as follows:

> "In case any of the States engaged in the dispute fails to comply with the obligations set forth in the foregoing Articles, the Contracting States undertake to make every effort in their power for the maintenance of peace. To that end, and in their character of neutrals, they shall adopt a common and solidary attitude: they shall exercise the political, juridical or economic means authorized by International Law; they shall bring the influence of public opinion to bear; but in no case shall they resort to intervention either diplomatic or armed. . . ."

37. The Government of the United States, with this invasion of Grenada, has also violated the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Re-establishment of Peace,[2] of 23 December 1936, which has been in force and binding upon the United States since 25 August 1937. Its Additional Protocol relative to Non-intervention[3] states the following in article I:

> "The High Contracting Parties declare inadmissible the intervention by any one of them, directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of any other of the Parties."

38. Furthermore, the United States has violated the following provisions of the charter of the Organization of American States. Article 18 states the following:

> "No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic, and cultural elements."

In invading Grenada, the United States has also violated Article 20, which reads as follows:

> "The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. . . ."

That means: not even for five or six days. Article 21 of the same charter reads as follows:

> "The American States bind themselves in their international relations not to have recourse to the use of force, except in the case of self-defence in accordance with existing treaties or in fulfilment thereof."

39. Finally, Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations states:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

40. All the aforementioned treaties and conventions have been duly signed and ratified by the United States, whose State Department has included them among the treaties in force at present. This means that, in accordance with Article VI of the United States Constitution, these are the supreme law of the land, a concept which involves the obligation of members of the Government of the United States to abide by them and to implement them. Hence it derives from their violation that the present United States Administration has not only placed the United States in the category of a State which is internationally delinquent but also has led the United States to violate its own Constitution and laws.

41. The fact that the use of force is increasing is alarming, together with the use of military intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. Governments hostile to the emancipation of peoples continue to violate the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries.

42. As this time, we only have to remember some of the most relevant aspects of the history of acts of aggression and intervention by the United States against Latin America. I shall be very brief and give just a few fundamental examples. In 1846, President Polk ordered troops to occupy the territory claimed by Mexico in what is now Texas, thus beginning the Mexican war. The United States annexed the land under dispute, besides California and New Mexico, after its victory in 1848. In 1854 American Marines destroyed the Nicaraguan port city of Greystone in order to avenge the holding of an American minister in that country. In 1855, the freebooters of William Walker came to Nicaragua for the purpose of annexing the whole of Central America to the southern states of the United States. Walker proclaimed himself president and established slavery in Nicaragua—real slavery. That same year, Colonels Kinneys and Fabens, in active service, proclaimed the so-called independence of San Juan del Norte, sovereign territory of Nicaragua.

43. In 1873—just to give a few of the most signal dates—during the struggle of Panama to gain independence from Colombia, American troops intervened in that country. There were similar disembarkations in 1885, 1901, 1902 and 1903. In 1898 the navy blockaded Cuban ports in the Spanish-American War, in which the army and volunteers were also involved. In 1904, the Marines disembarked in Ancon and other points in Panama. That was the year that

Theodore Roosevelt drew up the "Roosevelt Corollary", in other words, the policy of the great stranglehold. In 1909, the United States intervened in Nicaragua in order to overthrow the Government of General José Santos Zelaya through the "Knox Note" of ill-fame. In 1914, in order to ensure Haiti's payment of a loan, the navy disembarked on the island, marched to the National Bank and took half the gold to the United States. In 1914, President Wilson ordered the navy to bombard and take the city of Veracruz during undeclared hostilities against Mexico.

44. In 1926, after abandoning the country for a few months, the Marines came back to occupy Nicaragua. This new military occupation lasted until 1933, when the Yankee troops were obliged to withdraw in the face of the heroic resistance of the defending army of national sovereignty led by Augusto César Sandino. In 1954, the United States, through the Central Intelligence Agency, overthrew the Government of General Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala. In 1961, the American military mission led a coup against a civilian-military junta in El Salvador of a nationalist character, and there was an invasion of Cuba in the Bay of Pigs by an army of exiles under the auspices of the United States which ended in failure. In 1964, American troops based in the Panama Canal Zone attacked a nationalist demonstration and murdered 30 Panamanians. In 1965, 22,000 troops disembarked in the Dominican Republic during civil unrest in that country. In 1979, the Secretary of State of the United States, at the 17th OAS meeting for consultations, called for a military intervention in Nicaragua to foil the popular Sandinist victory. American helicopters landed in Costa Rica in a plan to interfere in our war of liberation.

45. This history of interventions, placed side by side with the treaties and conventions under which the United States is bound and which it has violated, leads us to ask: by what right have we been so vexed? by what right have we been invaded? by what right has the status of protectorate been forced upon us? It has always been on the theory of the national security of the United States, excusing its acts of intervention for the protection of United States citizens, the protection of innocent lives, holding back chaos, helping to restore order and to create United States-type institutions, thus bringing, as a result, such policies and doctrines as manifest destiny, the Monroe Doctrine, the great stranglehold and dollar diplomacy.

46. General Smedley D. Butler vaunted the following:

> "I spent 33 years and four months in active service as a member of the mobile military troop of my country: the Marine Corps. During that period I spent most of my time working in high financial affairs for Wall Street and bankers. In sum I was an extortionist at the service of capitalism. I helped make Mexico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba decent places for the National City Bank boys to collect revenue in. From 1905 to 1912 I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped to make Honduras ripe for the American fruit companies in 1903."

47. The representative of the United States in this Council on 25 March 1983 [*2423rd meeting*]—this year, in other words—in accepting the interventionist, ill-fated policies of her country said that, fortunately, it was a new nation and had set aside any interventionist practice a long time ago. She similarly stated that "the United States indeed has no intention of invading anyone or of conducting an armed action against anyone, or of occupying any other country"* [*ibid., para. 168*]. Those words were spoken just a few short months ago in this same Security Council in reference to the region of Central America and the Caribbean.

48. It is also worth recalling the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which highlighted the importance of giving special attention to and persisting in endeavours to find peaceful settlements to disputes arising among member States of the Movement. It was stated that many such disputes and differences were exacerbated by former colonial Powers or were the outcome of imbalances imposed from outside, rather than a deliberate intent on the part of the States concerned to kindle animosity between them. Efforts to do away with such conditions and to establish equitable relations among States were one of the main motivations for the establishment of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

49. Today, mankind as a whole has witnessed the sincerity and "good will" expressed by the United States in the Security Council a few months ago. Grenada has been invaded and its people are being massacred. Innocent blood is being shed and the security of all the people of Grenada is imperilled.

50. In this regard, I should like to read out the communiqué issued by the Ministry of External Relations of the Republic of Nicaragua as a result of today's events. It reads as follows:

[*The speaker read the text of the annex to document S/16069.*]

51. The United States has shown its true colours once again. How long will mankind passively stand by in the face of these genocidal acts? The invasion of Grenada is a direct and inexcusable attack on peace-loving peoples and countries. We vigorously urge the Security Council to condemn that flagrant violation of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

52. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I obviously listened with interest to the extraordinary statement of the representative of Nicaragua which we have just heard. I should like to say that the United States does not accept as accurate, as a description of our role or of any conditions in the world, the statements of the Government of Nicaragua either in their letter to the President of the Security Council or in the remarks they just made.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

53. The United States would have preferred not to speak at all tonight and would not have, had there not been such an extraordinary distortion of our history, our policies and practices, and also of theirs. We are interested that the Government of Nicaragua is so agitated tonight, and agitated once again with fantasies of being invaded by the United States. I should like to say that in the realm of psychopathology those concerns are well understood. They fall in the realm of projection, and those who are subject to them are countries, for example, which cannot imagine behaving in any other way than in the ways they accuse others of behaving.

54. It is doubtless true that the Government of Nicaragua cannot imagine a Government having great strength and not using it against hapless, helpless neighbours. The Government of Nicaragua, having small strength, uses it in an uninhibited fashion against its neighbours and, imagining that everyone and all countries would behave in that way, is obviously concerned about having more powerful neighbours. It is trapped in the fantasies of dictatorships and locked—as Thomas Hobbes said—in a restless striving after power that ceases only in death.

55. The fact is that the United States really does not require lectures in constitutional law and the observation of treaties from the Government of Nicaragua. We are quite aware of the status of treaties in our own constitutional system, and we are a Government of laws. We freely and resolutely submit ourselves to our laws, to the disciplines of our laws and our courts, our legislatures and our populations who elect those legislatures to hold us to our own values and our promises.

56. As I have said here before, we could hope nothing better for the people of Nicaragua than that they be permitted, as a free electorate, to discuss their public issues, to choose their representatives, to elect their governors, to discuss public issues and to make their decisions.

57. I found it very interesting to hear the representative of the Nicaraguan Junta describe the various provisions of the Rio Treaty and the treaty of the OAS to which his Government, as well as mine, is a signatory. The Government of Nicaragua will, of course, have an opportunity to discuss those questions tomorrow in the OAS, where the OECS will be discussing the issues involved in the tragic events in Grenada.

58. I found it interesting to hear the representative of the Government of Nicaragua describe as unacceptable the decision of the States of the eastern Caribbean to invoke the treaty which binds them in a pact of mutual assistance as well as mutual respect for sovereignty, and he seemed to suggest that their size, the fact that they are small States, somehow rendered it inappropriate for them to have linked themselves to each other by treaty relationship, and even more inappropriate for them to have invoked the treaty which they had written and signed for their mutual protection.

59. I found it interesting to hear him refer to the United States having convoked a meeting of the CONDECA group. Once again, of course, the familiar disregard of history was present. The United States did no such thing. I found it interesting to hear him reproach the United States for lack of respect for the sovereignty and national independence of neighbouring States. In fact, the United States is meticulous in its respect for the sovereign rights of our neighbours and also for their national independence. We respect even the rights of our neighbours to make serious mistakes, as when they choose governments like that of the Government of Nicaragua.

60. We listened with interest as we heard the representative of the Government of Nicaragua reproach the United States Government today with every act ever committed by any citizen or even any inhabitant of our country since we either were or were not discovered by Columbus some 500 years ago. He mentioned William Walker, the interventions that—this is amusing—presumably prevented Panama's successful rebellion against Colombia. Of course, he forgot then to mention that the United States had also intervened in an earlier phase to help Panama establish itself in a rebellion against Colombia and to help it establish itself as an independent State.

61. The fact is that the relevance of these historic events in our country—some of which are indeed reprehensible, some of which are not reprehensible, and all of which constitute an absolutely biased and hysterically distorted history of the western hemisphere—again testifies only to the lack of any capacity for history as well as for present analysis. It never occurred to me in my most reflective moments, or condemnatory ones, as I reflected on the policy of the current Government of Nicaragua, for example, to reproach it with all of the crimes of the Somozist predecessors. It never really occurred to me to reproach the current Government of Nicaragua with all of the crimes of the oligarchs who governed that country for centuries and who repressed the peasants of that region. It never even really seriously occurred to me to reproach our Soviet colleagues for the excesses of some of their czarist predecessors.

62. But the representative of Nicaragua has introduced into our considerations here new standards of relevance. And so, at midnight tonight, we can reflect not on the events in the eastern Caribbean, not on the organization of the Government of Nicaragua or of its policies, and not on its more recent history, when it made solemn promises to the OAS, which promises it exploited and then discarded, and when it made solemn promises to its own people, which promises it profited from and then has cast aside and forgot. Frankly, it would not have occurred to me to discuss any of these issues at midnight, nor do I propose to linger over them. I do recommend, however, that if our colleague from Nicaragua is seriously interested in these questions of the application of the amendments and provisions of the Rio Treaty and the OAS founding act, that he pursue that in the appropriate arena, which, of course, happens to be the OAS.

63. Finally, I should like to say simply that the United States regrets the fact that we are meeting here tonight in clear violation of bourgeois conceptions of fairness to dis-

cuss this issue. We would have thought it more appropriate, as I said to my colleagues in informal consultations, to have conducted our discussions tomorrow morning, perhaps tomorrow afternoon, even to have honoured the normal practices of the Security Council and to have provided the head of State of the presidency of the OECS the opportunity to be present at the debate in which they are so deeply involved and by which they are affected.

64. The Security Council in its wisdom decided otherwise, reminding us once again perhaps that bourgeois conceptions of fairness are just that—bourgeois, liberal, democratic conceptions of fairness. But so then, of course, is the conception of the Security Council itself a residue of a liberal, democratic, bourgeois civilization and dream—a dream of nations meeting together, committed to peace, dedicated to the pursuit of fairness, ready to judge one another by the standards to which they are willing to submit.

65. This meeting tonight, and most especially the extraordinary statement of our Nicaraguan colleague, reminds us that these may indeed be outdated notions. But if these are outdated notions, so is this an outdated institution.

66. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to extend to you the sincerest congratulations of my delegation on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council in this troubled month of October. When we consider your patience and your well-known diplomatic skills, my delegation feels confident that the responsibilities of the Council under your stewardship will be efficiently and effectively discharged. The satisfaction which my delegation feels at seeing you presiding now is all the greater because of the relations of great friendship and solidarity which happily exist between the Governments of Jordan and Guyana.

67. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all those delegations which have paid tribute to me for my discharge of the duties of the presidency during the month of September.

68. In a statement issued in Georgetown on 20 October last, my President, Forbes Burnham, made public the deep grief and sense of shock which the people of Guyana felt at the death of the Prime Minister of Grenada, Mr. Maurice Bishop. Since those events, the situation in Grenada has deteriorated materially. There is now on Grenadian soil a foreign invasion force whose actions have led to great loss of life and extensive damage to property. Guyana, therefore, considers the convening of this meeting to be most timely. My delegation wishes to express its sympathy to the bereaved people of Grenada and also of Cuba on the losses they have today sustained.

69. Guyana has maintained a principled approach to the recent tragic events in Grenada. While expressing our profound grief at these developments, we nevertheless nourished the hope that the people of Grenada would seek to heal its wounds and, as a united nation, determine its future destiny within the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and in the wider international community.

70. As a general principle, Guyana is willing to participate in the mobilization of CARICOM forces to defend the integrity of any CARICOM State against an external aggressor. We are no less willing to participate in any CARICOM peace-keeping force in certain circumstances and under agreed terms of reference.

71. With specific regard to Grenada, however, we were, and continue to be, opposed to participation in any military invasion of Grenada, since such action constitutes interference in the internal affairs of that State.

72. We were of the view that the despatch of a fact-finding mission to Grenada, composed of CARICOM nationals, could be a helpful step. The point of contact for such a fact-finding mission would, of course, be the Governor-General as the legal authority of Grenada. We believe that the fact-finding mission, or whatever mechanisms to be agreed upon, should rest on certain clearly defined principles, among them: that no external elements should be involved in the search for a solution to the Grenada situation; that the solution should be regional in character, that is, formulated within the framework of CARICOM; that any solution must be fully in accordance with international law and with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations; and that the primary purpose of any regional solution would be the restoration of normalcy in Grenada.

73. The hostility which the United States Administration has felt towards the Government of the late Prime Minister Bishop and American concern about who Grenada's friends were are no secret to anyone in this chamber. What my delegation finds painfully disturbing is the fact that, at a moment when the States of our region are intensifying their efforts to have the Caribbean recognized as a zone of peace and to strengthen the security and independence of the States of our region, some of my CARICOM colleagues appear, by their action, to be endorsing this hostility towards Grenada and to be concurring in outside intervention in the affairs of the region. Such action can only be harmful to our region.

74. A policy of choosing governments for others and meting out punishment to those which are considered unacceptable is as alien to the political traditions of the Caribbean as were the disturbing events which occurred in Grenada last week. Guyana is not aware of the existence of any instrument or arrangement which authorizes intervention in any Caribbean State. Grenada posed no threat to any of its neighbours. My delegation understands that all foreigners on the island were safe and that at no time was their welfare in question.

75. According to the Chancellor of St. George's Medical College, American students had begun leaving the islands since yesterday afternoon without harassment or intimidation. The action being taken against Grenada is therefore in clear violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, which states:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

76. My delegation has had cause to state in this forum in the past, and feels the need to so repeat, that in the relations between States, the strictest respect must be shown for the principles of international law. That is our only guarantee of peaceful and stable inter-State relations. Intervention as an instrument of State behaviour was long ago outlawed by the international community.

77. In 1970, the General Assembly, by resolution 2625 (XXV), adopted the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. That Declaration, taking the Charter as its point of departure, solemnly proclaimed the principle that States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations. It also sets forth the principle that States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

78. In December 1981, the General Assembly, by resolution 36/103, adopted the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States. That Declaration sets out, in unambiguous language, the duties comprehended in the principle of non-intervention and non-interference. Those duties include:

"The duty of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing [international] ... boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social, or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government, to cause tension between or among States or to deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage;

"...

"The duty of a State to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any ... form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force;

"...

"The duty of a State to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of another State or of any of its institutions."[4]

79. This Declaration enjoys the total support of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries because its principles are principles which have historically been a cornerstone of the Movement. We felt it was necessary to set them out in lucid declaratory form, as another protection for small States which are invariably the victims of aggression and intervention.

80. My delegation has this evening introduced a draft resolution [*S/16077*] which approaches the current situation in Grenada strictly from the perspective of the Charter of the United Nations, the time-honoured and sacred principles which lie at the heart of our international Organization, and the obligations on all States strictly to abide by these principles in their international behaviour.

81. Among other things, the draft resolution condemns the armed intervention in Grenada and calls for the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces. It calls on all States to show the strictest respect for Grenada's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and requests the Secretary-General closely to monitor the development of the situation and to report to the Council, within 48 hours, on the implementation of the resolution.

82. We are convinced that this draft resolution represents a worthy and credible response by the Council to the dangerous and critical situation existing in Grenada today. We remain open to receiving comments, observations and suggestions which could enable us to enhance the effectiveness of this response.

83. The tragic events of today give rise to implications and to concerns for all members of the international community. It is patently clear from the history of the Latin American region, dating back to the start of this century, that military interventionist policies do not resolve problems; in fact, those policies most often serve to perpetuate and to exacerbate problems and to create new problems. The real danger is that military actions mightr result in the creation of a new hotbed of tension, thus generating greater instability within the region.

84. The members of the Caribbean Community, which includes all the members of the OECS and other members of the expeditionary force, have long stated their acknowledgement that ideological pluralism is a reality and must be respected. The explanations advanced are at great variance with that stated belief for today's intervention. The need to tolerate other people's choice of developmental paths and choice of political strategy is the basis of respect for ideological pluralism. Thus the view expressed that the Government of Maurice Bishop was alien to the political environment of the Caribbean is a thinly disguised attempt by some States to impose their choice of political strategy upon another State. It is no coincidence that the chosen instrument for their imposition and intervention was the very super-Power which is diametrically opposed on ideological grounds to the Bishop Government. The question which now arises is whether the intervention is a reaction to events taking place after Mr. Bishop's death or whether it is designed to ensure the total demise of his legacy.

85. Guyana is genuinely concerned at the dangers which the present intervention generates. For when States arrogate to themselves the right to seek help to destroy the Governments of those States whose policies they find disagreeable, then who among us can feel safe? The claim has been advanced that this intervention is in pursuit of peace and democracy, but is not the true test of democracy in international relations the ability to tolerate those who do not follow our every whim or fancy, or the whims and fancies of our partners? If the international system cannot find it democratic and just that the small, the poor, the weak be protected from the powerful and from others, then I fear that, far from being democratic, we are instead submitting to a Hobbesian system which recognizes only the powerful and the fittest and their interests. Democracy has thus been poorly served in Grenada today.

86. With regard to the future, my delegation sees the adoption and implementation of the draft resolution we have proposed as a first step towards restoration of the normalcy in Grenada which we all desire.

87. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from Arabic)*: The next speaker is the representative of Grenada. I call upon him.

88. Mr. JACOBS (Grenada): I should like to start my presentation by reading the text of a telex that was sent from the Revolutionary Military Council of Grenada to the Embassy of the United States in Barbados on 24 October. The text is as follows:

"It is our information that at a meeting of some CARICOM Governments in Port of Spain, Trinidad, on Sunday, 23 October 1983, some of the participating Governments decided on establishing a military force to invade Grenada. In their decision they called for direct participation of extra-regional forces in invading Grenada. We are concerned because in many reports the name of the Government of the United States of America has been mentioned as participating in such a military force to invade our country. We also have concrete information that for the past 18 hours two warships have been patrolling between 12 and 15 kilometres off the shores of Grenada, well within our territorial waters.

"We would view any invasion of our country, whether based on the decisions of those CARICOM Governments, or on that of any other Government, as a rude violation of Grenada's sovereignty and of international law. Furthermore any such invasion can only lead to loss of lives of thousands of men, women and children. Therefore we strongly condemn such a decision.

"The present situation in Grenada is of an entirely internal and domestic nature, and presently peace, calm and good order prevail in our country. For these reasons we do not understand the basis or the reasons for the reported violent reaction of some Caribbean and other Governments. We view any threat or the use of force by any country or group of countries as a gross and unwarranted interference in the domestic affairs of our sovereign and independent country.

"Grenada has not threatened and is not threatening the use of force against any country, and we do not have such aspirations. Our armed forces and people are fully prepared to courageously defend the sovereignty and integrity of our country with dignity and determination. However, we are not seeking military confrontation with any country or group of countries, but, on the contrary, we are prepared to hold discussions with those countries in order to ensure good relations and mutual understanding and with a view to maintaining and strengthening the historic ties with all of these countries.

"We are also concerned about the reports that the Government of the United States of America is considering sending battleships to evacuate citizens of your country presently residing peacefully in Grenada. We reiterate that the lives, well-being and property of every American and other foreign citizen resident in Grenada are fully protected and guaranteed by our Government. However, any American or foreign citizen in our country who desires to leave Grenada for whatever reason can freely do so using the normal procedures through our airport and commercial aircraft. As far as we are concerned, these aircraft can be regular flights or charter flights, and we will facilitate them in every way we can.

"We have been further informed that 500 parents of American students studying in Grenada at the St. George's University School of Medicine today met in New York and unanimously agreed on a resolution calling on the United States of America not to take precipitate and provocative action against Grenada. We have also been informed during the last two hours"—at that time it was 2 a.m.—"by Dr. Geoffrey Bourne, Vice Chancellor of the St. George's School of Medicine, where most of your U.S. citizens are based, that less than 10 per cent of these students wish to leave Grenada at this time. In fact Dr. Bourne stated this in his own voice on Radio Free Grenada in a telephone conversation with the newsroom less than three hours ago.

"We further assure you that any U.S. and other foreign citizens who choose to leave Grenada in the coming days and who wish to return to Grenada in the future are welcome to do so. We are for peace, friendship and for maintaining the historically established ties between our countries and hope they would grow and strengthen.

"We further take this opportunity to inform your Government that the Revolutionary Military Council of Grenada has no desire or aspiration to rule the country. We are presently beginning the process of establishing a fully constituted civilian Government within 10 to 14 days. Such a Government would be broad-based, expressing the interests of all social classes and strata in our country. We have already held discussions with our

local Chamber of Commerce and industry, commercial bank managers and hoteliers as part of the process of constituting such a Government. Our civilian Government would pursue a policy of mixed economy, with State, co-operative and private sectors, and would encourage foreign and local investments within the framework of the national interests of the country.

"In closing we wish to state once more that there is absolutely no basis whatsoever for any country launching an invasion on our beloved homeland."

89. I said that that text was sent to the United States Embassy in Barbados on 24 October. As we meet on the morning of 26 October, we are faced with a very grave situation in the Caribbean—one which has been directly brought about by the intervention of the United States in the sovereign and independent country of Grenada.

90. Many of us have been hearing various excuses put forward for such action. Perhaps the most frequent is the statement that United States citizens were in danger in Grenada. Of course, from the text of the telex I have just read out, it is very clear that we had already assured the United States that no such danger existed. But further evidence exists suggesting that it was well known that there was no such danger to any United States citizens in Grenada at this time.

91. I can quote to the Council this evening a radio message telephoned from the same Chancellor of the University in St. George's, when he spoke to radio and televison reporters today here in the United States, in which he once again said unequivocally that there was never any danger to United States citizens or students associated with St. George's Medical School. Chancellor Modica said that any lives that may be lost in Grenada could only be on the hands of the President of the United States.

92. I think it is very clear that the pretext of protecting United States citizens was nothing more than a smokescreen that was put forward by the United States Government as an excuse for intervening in Grenada. In fact, this morning the President of the United States, Mr. Reagan, made a statement in which, despite the evidence, he once again said that one of the main reasons for United States troops having intervened in Grenada was to protect the safety of American citizens—in the face of the statement by Mr. Modica, in the face of the statements that had been coming over radio and television for some time, in the face of the statements of his own officials who visited from Barbados just two days ago and confirmed the safety of American citizens in Grenada.

93. But deception has become the name of the game, and so it was not surprising that Mr. Reagan carried the deception one step further. He has now tried to convince the world that he has intervened with United States troops under the alleged clauses of the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States—to which, incidentally, as our Nicaraguan friends mentioned, the United States has never been a signatory.

94. Nevertheless, let us explore that latest justification. There are some very interesting facts which have emerged and which we need to be clear on in regard to this alleged treaty. In the first instance, in referring to the treaty, Mr. Reagan said that it had been invoked by the eastern Caribbean parties to it because those States had thought it necessary to intervene in Grenada in order to restore some sense of democracy there. Such a concept cannot be accepted in this body because no one person or one nation has a definition of "democracy", as our friends from Guyana have correctly pointed out. This body has on many occasions accepted the principle of plural ideology among nations within it.

95. But, more than that, we must also look at the spurious explanation that was presented by Mr. Reagan in the company of Eugenia Charles for the intervention by the United States in association with some of these eastern Caribbean States. They said they were invoking article 8 of this treaty. The text of that article has been circulated to many members of the Security Council and I know that many of them have read it and are very baffled at how and under what pretext or circumstances it could be invoked as an excuse to intervene in Grenada.

96. As outlined in article 8, it is very clear that intervention can come only if there is a request from a member Government for such intervention and only if there is a threat of external intervention against that particular Government. I ask all members of the Security Council to look at that article for themselves, and they will have to search extensively to try and find any justification within that article for intervention by forces of eastern Caribbean States in association with the United States.

97. However, I think that is just another smokescreen for what is really happening in Grenada today, and I believe it is very important that we all be very clear on what is going on. There is no doubt in anyone's mind as to who is really behind the invasion of Grenada. Talk of a multinational force is a joke—an absolute joke—because over 95 per cent of the forces present in Grenada tonight are from the United States, and those forces are there in keeping with what has been the policy of the United States towards the people and the revolution of Grenada since 13 March 1979.

98. I should like to share with the Council a brief chronicle of some of the reactions of the United States to the Government and the people of Grenada during that period, if there is any doubt in anybody's mind about what has taken place and for what reason. Nobody should be surprised tonight at what has happened in Grenada. Nobody should be surprised that it is the United States that is in the forefront of the attack on the Grenada revolution. We simply have to look at the facts. Take the 1980 plot which was revealed in *The Washington Post* just six months ago—a plot which detailed an attempt by the United States to organize and execute the overthrow of the Government of the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada. We have to keep in mind too "Ocean Venture 1981" and "Ocean Venture 1982", which included, among other things, "Amber" and the "Amberines"—an exercise

that involved the mock invasion of an island off the coast of Puerto Rico called Vieques, an island very similar to the island of Grenada. It is not mere coincidence that the troops of the United States that are in Grenada tonight are those same troops that took part in those activities in "Ocean Venture 1981" and "Ocean Venture 1982", the Rangers.

99. We must be very clear on what is taking place in Grenada tonight, and we must understand very clearly that this is part of the activity and the plot the United States has been pursuing for some time. That is very clear.

100. But we do not have to look to the ancient history—if one may so describe it—of the past two or three years to see the evidence of what the United States is about in Grenada today. We must look at statements coming out of the Administration itself. I listened to President Reagan's press conference yesterday morning, and I assume that many members of the Security Council also listened to it. I heard him state specifically that the invasion of Grenada involving United States troops had been carried out at the request of the OECS. He said that he had received that request on Sunday and that he acted immediately. Yet within an hour the Administration publicly admitted on radio and television that as long ago as last week—Wednesday—preparations for the invasion of Grenada had been finalized. That is a matter of public record.

101. Later yesterday an Administration spokesman, Mr. Speakes, was quoted on radio and television as saying that actions against Grenada of both a covert and overt character had been stepped up considerably in the past two to three weeks in anticipation of what took place in Grenada.

102. The evidence is very clear, and it all points in one direction, the direction of the United States.

103. As a result of this gross, flagrant violation of Grenada's territorial integrity, the people of Grenada are tonight suffering untold hardships. Despite reports being issued by the United States, we have other reports that indicate many deaths. We have been receiving reports from our embassies around the world that as many as 700 people, many of them civilians, have been killed as a result of the attack launched by the United States.

104. It is well known that Grenada is a very small and poor country. It is well known that we could never be expected to be able to fight a country as big and as sophisticated as the United States. Therefore, it is not surprising that we are suffering heavy casualties. But, despite these things, we are continuing to fight and to resist the actions of the United States, and we look to our friends and to the international community generally to examine carefully what is happening in Grenada today and to ask themselves whether this is fair, whether it is the way in which to deal with international affairs in 1983. Are we to return to the period of the 1950s and 1960s? Are we to allow size and power to determine whether or not a country has the right to pursue its policies as it has chosen? Have we reached such a stage in the world today that no country can be allowed to pursue its policies without the dictates of another country, much bigger, thousands of times the size of our country, trying to tell us what we must do?

105. All of us must ask ourselves this, all of us, because the United States is one of the biggest countries in the world, and Grenada is one of the smallest, and many of the countries represented by those present in the chamber tonight, though bigger than Grenada, are much smaller than the United States. If today the United States can invade Grenada and impose a Government to its liking, international law has collapsed and the world will turn to anarchy. We cannot allow ourselves to sit back idly and let that happen.

106. Speaking on behalf of the people of Grenada and as a Grenadian, I am appealing to the international community to examine the situation very, very carefully. Whatever has happened in Grenada is an internal affair. Whatever arms the Grenada people and revolution have are arms to defend Grenada and the people of Grenada. We do not have the tanks, the navy and the air force that the United States is throwing at our people tonight, but we do feel that we have an international reputation, which we have demonstrated in international organizations over the past four and a half years, that deserves consideration when people look at what is happening. We have fought consistently and with principle in all international organizations, as many of those present tonight know.

107. We have no desire to fight with the United States. We have repeated that on many occasions, and, of course, we repeated it again on 24 October this year. However, it is very clear that in today's world the United States has decided that might is right, that nobody has the right to decide his destiny unless the United States feels that it is the correct destiny.

108. We appeal to the international body tonight to look at that situation. I ask those present to search their souls deeply and to ask themselves whether we can allow the world to run in this fashion. In making that appeal I ask the Security Council to condemn in the strongest language possible what has taken place in Grenada.

109. More than that, on behalf of the people of Grenada, who are tonight suffering an onslaught of untold terror, an attack that is costing hundreds and perhaps thousands of lives, I am asking the Security Council please to call for an immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces from our country. It is the only thing we can do. It is the only right thing. It is not fair for us to be subjected to this vicious and obviously planned attack. Twenty-one ships from the United States are present in our territorial waters. Tanks, bazookas and all kinds of sophisticated arms are being thrown at our people.

110. Reports tell of resistance, and I know that the people of Grenada are resisting tonight. But we must ask this international body to express its strongest condemnation, because, if we do not do that, what has happened in Grenada today could happen to any one of us tomorrow, and nobody can stop it once it starts.

111. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from Arabic)*: The next speaker is the representative of Cuba, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

112. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: On 20 October 1983, only five days ago, in the communiqué of the Communist Party and the Revolutionary Government of Cuba—which informed the Cuban people of the unfortunate events which had taken place in Grenada as a result of serious differences within the New Jewel Movement led by Mr. Maurice Bishop and which came to a tragic head on 19 October with the death of that individual and of several of his close assistants, all of them leaders of the Grenadian revolutionary process—Cuba stated its conviction that the situation brought about by these tragic events would be exploited by imperialism against the Grenadian revolution.

113. That conviction became a bloody reality in the early hours of 25 October, when forces of the United States Army and Marine Corps, along with a tiny group from some Caribbean States which had disgracefully joined in this act of aggression against a sister country, landed by air and by sea in the city of Saint George's and at other points on the island with the intention of overthrowing the Grenadian revolution and of returning the country to its previous abject condition of a puppet of Yankee imperialism.

114. In a press conference held this morning, the President of the United States stated with unheard-of cynicism, "This morning, forces from six Caribbean democracies and the United States began to disembark on the island of Grenada in the eastern Caribbean." This, according to the Yankee leader, was in response to the "urgent, formal request of five nations members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States to help them restore order and democracy in the island of Grenada."

115. It was with such an altruistic motive, and at the request of some members of an organization of which Grenada is a founding member—but to whose meeting last weekend it was not, of course, invited—but with the express opposition of Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago and Belize, that the imperialist United States Government, along with Barbados and Jamaica—which are not members of that organization but have acted as supernumeraries in the aggression—recklessly launched its Marines and soldiers, who are, to use a word of President Reagan's, the real gangsters of his so-called democracy, against the heroic people of little Grenada.

116. With characteristic impudence, the gentleman who sent Yankee troops, so he said, to defend the independence of Lebanon and who is now deeply mired in a shameful intervention in the internal affairs of that country, said this morning that he was taking action "constrained by events, and in order to protect American lives".

117. If what the representative of the Grenadian revolution said today before the Council were not enough, we might also recall that yesterday—or, I should say, the day before yesterday, for we are now into 26 October—the United States consul at Saint George's stated that the United States citizens there, including the medical students, were perfectly well. The representative of the Grenadian Government stated the same to the diplomatic representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, affirming that anyone who wanted to leave the country would be able to do so without any problem as soon as international flights were resumed on Monday.

118. Not a single press report of the last five days, not excluding those of United Press International, Associated Press and other well known United States press agencies, has indicated that a single United States citizen had in any way been attacked, injured or so much as touched in Grenada.

119. Furthermore, no Grenadian revolutionary has yet appealed for help from the Caribbean countries which have now leapt onto that country, like thieving jackals onto the prey of the tiger, and much less from the Yankee Government. These have all been the well-known and declared enemies of the Grenadian revolution since 1979. No Grenadian revolutionaries have even turned to their friends, to friendly countries, to help them solve the internal problems which have arisen in the last weeks and months.

120. How can a treaty to which Grenada itself is a signatory be invoked to call on the imperialist Yankee Government to invade that tiny country when there is not a single article in its text which can justify this perfidious aggression? Where is the threat to the security of the other States signatories? Where are the foreign mercenaries—unless they are the Yankee troops and the jackals unleashed by their reactionary hangers-on and miserable lackies against the people of Grenada—which are referred to in article 8 of the treaty being invoked? Was that treaty, indeed, ever registered with the United Nations? Everything points to the contrary. Therefore, in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, that treaty cannot be invoked before any organ of the United Nations. Therefore, even the shabby and minuscule fig-leaf with which they are trying to hide their interventionist shame is useless for their unspeakable purposes.

121. I shall not now make reference to the cries of the hyenas that we heard this morning from Washington or that were heard in the parliament in Kingston. The hyenas will not doubt feel satisfied with the kind applause of the tiger and the courtesies proffered in the retinue of treachery. It will not be long before they have to settle accounts with the peoples of the world, but we cannot fail to condemn as cynical and false the various statements made today, in an attempt to justify the unjustifiable, by the Secretary of State of the United States and by the President of that country himself.

122. What is beyond question is that Grenada—an independent, sovereign and non-aligned country and a full Member of the United Nations—has been the victim of an act of armed, unprovoked, unjustified aggression in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. It is beyond question that its territory has been

treacherously and brutally invaded by foreign forces led by a permanent member of this Council, the United States of America, which had not the slightest shame in once again trampling under foot the principles of this Organization.

123. With incredible gall, its representative in this Council informed the Secretary-General today in a letter [*S/16076*] that the United States was intervening to fill the "dangerous vacuum of authority now existing in Grenada", which was considered to be "a threat to the peace and security of the eastern Caribbean". What section of the Charter authorizes a State or group of States to intervene in the affairs of another State on the basis of a supposed "vacuum of authority" in that State? What international legal instrument characterizes a supposed power-vacuum in any country as a threat to the peace and security of another State? Where does contemporary psychopathology place such arguments?

124. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations unequivocally states:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

125. It is plain that the Government of the United States and the countries that serve as its henchmen in this ignominious chapter of American history have grossly, forcibly violated the political independence and territorial integrity of Grenada, acting in a manner inconsistent not only with the purposes but with the very letter of the Charter.

126. One need not have a very good memory to recall how, in much the same way as it has acted in Grenada, the United States invaded the Dominican Republic in 1965; how it used other Latin American henchmen to justify its intervention under so-called collective action; how, finally, it utilized the docile rubber stamp of its worn-out colonial office—also known as the OAS—to justify with the heading that insults the honour of our peoples its crime against the Dominican people. It was the same United States that invaded Mexico, taking more than 40 per cent of its territory, despite the protestations that we have heard today concerning the United States alleged respect for its neighbours. It was the same United States that trampled underfoot the nations of Sandino, Hostos and Martí, conspired in the last century against the great Latin American homeland of Simón Bolívar and set up house in Panama. It occupied Haiti and attacked Honduras; it overthrew the Governments of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala and Salvador Allende in Chile. The same United States shores up genocidal Governments in El Salvador and Guatemala and shamelessly commits acts of aggression against Nicaragua from neighbouring territory, threatens Cuba and proclaims military solutions for Central American problems in response to the peoples' rebellion against the famine, poverty and exploitation to which they have been subjected by the dominant oligarchies and Yankee monopolistic interests.

127. Thus Mr. Kissinger headed a mission to Central America precisely in order to declare that the only solution to the problems of Central America was the military one. And let the representative of the United States deny this if she can.

128. It was the same United States that lauched the mercenary invasion of the Bay of Pigs against my country, where it received its first great defeat in our continent. It is the same United States which is the close partner of the Israeli zionists and South African racists; yesterday's, today's and tomorrow's enemies of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America; the defenders of *apartheid*, the Ku Klux Klan, the "Big Stick" policy and the policy of force; the same country that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima because the Japanese are not white; the same ones who dropped more bombs on the heroic martyred people of Viet Nam then were used in the Second World War; it was the same United States which in its "Ocean Venture I" and "Ocean Venture II" in the occupied Puerto Rican island of Vieques, as just recalled by Mr. Jacobs of Grenada, rehearsed in minute detail today's sinister invasion of Grenada.

129. Those are the hangmen of the people of Grenada. Look them in the face, because one day they will be judged, just as the Nazi war criminals were at Nuremburg.

130. In the 20 October communiqué which I mentioned, the Communist Party and the Revolutionary Government of Cuba warned that we would not remove the group of about 1,000 Cuban workers—among them doctors, teachers, technicians and the members of a small military mission advising the Grenadian defence forces and giving assistance to the country—so as to avoid disruption of services essential to the population, although we would carefully examine future political relations with the new leaders of Grenada. It was precisely that group of Cubans, to whom Prime Minister Maurice Bishop had given light arms so that they might defend themselves against the oft-repeated threat of Yankee invasion, who in the early hours of today were the object of a cowardly, treacherous suprise attack launched by the Yankee army and navy, equipped with artillery, infantry, helicopters and airplanes.

131. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba has issued eight reports concerning the situation of the construction workers and advisers. The first indicated the commencement of the aggression, announcing that "at 0904 hours, Cuban time, on 25 October, an undetermined number of Cuban personnel were killed or wounded".

132. Beginning with that first report, the Revolutionary Government has kept the Cuban people informed of developments, as is its custom, stressing the heroic resistance of that small group of Cubans who had gone to that sister country to help it build a just and democratic society after the overthrow of the corrupt Yankee puppet Mr. Gairy. Together with the Grenadian people, they were steadfast in their defence of Grenada's territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, even in the face of superior forces and equipment.

133. At 2000 hours New York time on 25 October I received the following messages which had appeared in an official communiqué to the Cuban people, and which I read out this afternoon—or rather, yesterday afternoon—to the Secretary-General, on instruction of my Government:

> "As a follow-up to earlier information, the people are informed that at 1345 hours the chief of the Cuban construction workers and advisory personnel, Colonel Pedro Tortoló Comas, who had arrived in Grenada on a working visit yesterday, Monday, to take charge of all the Cuban personnel, reported that Yankee troops had taken one construction worker prisoner; they stated that they were not looking for problems with the Cubans and that therefore they were proposing the surrender of all Cuban personnel. Colonel Tortoló confirmed, however, that they would not surrender but would await the Commander-in-Chief's instructions. A few minutes later, jeeps armed with machine guns and cannon approached with Cuban hostages in front of them. Cuba responded: 'we congratulate you for your heroic resistance. The Cuban people is proud of you. You must not surrender for any reason. If the enemy sends Government representatives, listen to them and make your views known.' The reply of Colonel Tortoló at 1423 hours, Cuban time, was: 'Commander-in-Chief, we shall carry out your orders and will not surrender. Fatherland or death. We shall overcome.'"

134. At 2300 hours, New York time, on 25 October, just a few minutes ago, I received communiqué no. 8 from the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, which reads as follows:

> "The people were informed at nightfall of the continuing heroic resistance of our construction workers and advisers in the face of the attacks of the Yankee armed forces. The revolutionary morale and the determination to defend themselves with dignity were unswerving. According to various reports, the Grenadian combatants are continuing to offer tough resistance."

135. That is the attitude of the Cuban construction workers and advisory personnel. Our people sent them to Grenada to work with our brothers on that island to build a better future, free from exploitation, illiteracy and unemployment and from subjection to imperialism. We sent them there to build, together with the unforgettable Maurice Bishop, an airport so ardently desired by the people of Grenada—the airport which the United States had refused to finance and whose soil has been spattered with Cuban blood. All that blood, together with that of the Grenadian patriots, will forever suffocate, like that of Danton, the representatives of empire and those who join them in their crafty and cowardly aggression against our Caribbean brothers.

136. Cuba unequivocally condemns the invasion carried out by the United States against the Republic of Grenada as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. Cuba reiterates the right of the people of Grenada, and of all peoples, freely to determine their own future and to work for the political, economic and social system which they have freely chosen, and demands the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of American troops and their henchmen from the territory of Grenada.

137. The Security Council cannot allow the policy of aggression of the present United States Administration to govern the fate of the international community, whether in the Middle East, in southern Africa or in Latin America. The Council must see that the rule of law and justice prevail, for the security of all States, including the small, heroic island of Grenada which has been invaded. The monstrous events of today can be repeated tomorrow in any other country, in any other part of the world, unless the hand of the aggressor is stayed. The crime committed today in Grenada can be repeated tomorrow in Nicaragua, in Cuba, in El Salvador, in Angola, in Namibia, in any other place. The international community must give serious thought to the risk involved for all Member States if this act of aggression against a Member State is left unpunished.

138. Cuba—which, together with the vast majority of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, alerted world public opinion to the danger of invasion and aggression which hung over the Republic of Grenada just a few weeks ago, at the ministerial meeting at United Nations Headquarters—cannot but express indignation at the constant flouting of the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the repeated use or threat of force by the Government of the United States. That Government, further, violates instruments that the United States itself has brought into being, such as the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Río de Janeiro in 1947[5] and already smashed to pieces when it joined with the United Kingdom in its military venture against the Malvinas Islands.

139. We hope that members of the Security Council will fulfil their obligations under the Charter and that, like Mexico and Guyana today, Latin Americans firmly condemn this act of aggression against a small American country which, in the highest tradition of Juárez, Martí and Bolívar, has rejected the degrading yoke of servitude in favour of "the star that illuminates and kills". We hope to see the Council adopt the draft resolution submitted by Guyana.

140. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

141. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I thank you for giving me this opportunity, as representative of a small country and small people, to express our opinion concerning these dangerous events which we are witnessing.

142. I ask myself—because I am indeed baffled—are we at the end of the twentieth century? Is this really the end of the twentieth century or are we in the eighteenth or nine-

teenth century? Are we living in a jungle, or are we living in a civilized world? What are the laws which govern us? Are they international laws, international norms, the Charter of the United Nations, or the law of the jungle, the law of the cowboys? It is our right and it is the right of everyone to pose such questions.

143. What is the future of the Charter which has been desecrated and trampled by the feet of the aggressors, the invaders who, until this very moment, are butchering the sons of the people of tiny Grenada? What is the meaning of peace? What is the meaning of principle and freedom?

144. We have heard the voice of the victim. We have heard the representative of the people of Grenada, 100,000 people who are being subjected to murder, who are being massacred on their own land. Their only sin is that they have chosen their own system, a system which does not satisfy the United States of America, the largest Power on earth, because the United States wants these small peoples to become their agents. They want to stifle the voice of those small countries.

145. Grenada, this small country, is constructing an airport so that it may be exploited for tourism. This is a great crime, a crime because the United States cannot permit Grenada to construct an airport, and the President of the most powerful country in the world has repeated the danger posed by the airport of that small country whose population does not exceed 100,000. The danger posed to the United States, to the security of the United States? This is indeed a shame and a farce. If I were the representative of the United States, I would be ashamed to speak and to defend such a policy.

146. How does the United States justify its invasion of Grenada? To defend its citizens? Its citizens, according to the reports of its emissaries, are facing absolutely no danger. Are they defending democracy, restoring democracy to Grenada? What kind of democracy? Is this the democracy of Bishop who, from the beginning of his revolution up to the last moment, faced plots hatched by the American Administration? He visited this country personally so as to establish normal relations with the United States, but this was rejected; he was condemned and plots were fomented against him. What is the democracy which the United States wishes to restore to Grenada? The democracy of the jungle? The democracy of the Marines?

147. A few days ago we heard the United States President, Mr. Reagan, say that the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu because they did not have the warship *New Jersey*. But two days after he said this, over 200 Americans fell victim to their Government's policy—and yet the warship *New Jersey* was not very far away. The United States President forgot to remind us that his country too was defeated in Viet Nam at the hands of the Vietnamese heroes. But the American defeat in the Middle East at the hands of the Lebanese people, in Lebanon, has shaken the United States Administration at home. The American people and their representatives are crying out against this policy of international gangsterism and intervention. So the United States Administration must find some way to gain an easy victory—and this easy victory will be Grenada, a small country with a population not exceeding 100,000, which is less than the population of one or two New York skyscrapers. The United States must achieve a victory because the President requires this for his electoral purposes. Of course, he does not shrink from sacrificing thousands of Grenadians on the altar of American elections. This is the law of the jungle. What use is there for values and principles?

148. The United States Administration says that it was called upon to take this action by neighbouring countries. This is a new rule in international law that could be used tomorrow against Libya, if a certain country requested the United States Administration's intervention to change the régime in Libya, or Nicaragua, or any other small country. As the representative of the Grenadian people—the victim—has said, there are countries represented here that are larger than Grenada, but they are small when confronted by American imperialism. That is true. We shall all face the same fate if this aggression is not halted and condemned. What is the significance of the Security Council after all this? The security of whom? The security of the United States of America. If the task of the Security Council is to protect the United States in its perpetration of aggression and invasion, then it will have lost all meaning and should no longer exist. If, on the other hand, its task is to preserve the security of the peoples, of small countries, then it should clearly say so and discharge its duties under the Charter—that is, if we can even say that there is a Charter anymore. What kind of a Charter is it that is trampled by the United States Marines in a small country with a population not exceeding 100,000 and with a surface not exceeding a dozen square kilometres?

149. What is the future of peace and security in the world? What is the future of those peoples? Yesterday we celebrated an anniversary of the United Nations. What kind of gift did the United States give the United Nations? A typical cowboy gift: attacking a small country with a small population, butchering thousands of persons in Grenada and occupying that island. This is indeed an excellent gift from American imperialism. That is the way the United States celebrated United Nations Day. These are the values defended by the United States Administration.

150. I do not think that this is the time to talk about the Charter—a time when the forces of evil and oppression are killing thousands in Grenada. I shall not even refer to international conventions which have not been respected by the American Administration but rather were trampled under the feet of its soldiers, not in defence of the rights of Namibians against South African imperialism, not in defence of the Lebanese under the occupation of Israel, the strategic ally of the United States, not in defence of the right of peoples struggling for freedom; but to suppress freedom and to kill weak human beings.

151. Sometimes power is a source of self-respect and deterrence. Where the United States Administration is concerned, however, might is merely international gangsterism and colonialism, the killing of Lebanese, and ultimately

the annihilation of a small country with a population not exceeding 100,000. This is American policy. How much longer will this continue? Yesterday Nicaragua and Libya, the day before yesterday Viet Nam. Today Lebanon, today the people of little Grenada, whose voice we just heard. We are aware that this is perhaps the last time we shall hear a free voice from Grenada. Tomorrow the United States Administration will come up with a new, democratic Government to represent the Grenadian people, a Government installed by the Marines. We do not know for how long this American Marine Government will be in power, but the representative of that people is their last voice.

152. The representative of the United States has critized the Security Council for meeting this evening. She says that it should have waited until tomorrow. Indeed it should have—because the operation has not been completed, because resistance continues, and the United States Administration needs some more time to discharge its lofty humanitarian task and kill the largest possible number of people in Grenada. The Council was indeed wrong to meet this evening; it should have met tomorrow afternoon, as requested by the United States representative—and I would have hoped that she would be here to listen to my remarks.

153. Let us speak the truth, however bitter, however difficult—especially when the poor and the weak are involved. How difficult it is to speak the truth. But we must be courageous and speak the truth. We must say this to the United States: you have committed aggression against a small country. This aggression must be condemned. We must denounce the killing and destruction of a small population. Condemnation may not suffice. We have heard repeated condemnations here. The United Nations has adopted many resolutions condemning United States policy. Has the United States complied with any of them? Has it complied with resolutions of the Security Council, which it has paralyzed through use of the veto? The United States Administration continues to commit aggression and to encourage aggression.

154. Angola is unable to have recourse to its Cuban friends in order to defend itself against the South African invasion, but the United States Administration is entitled to restore and to defend democracy and individual freedom. The representative of the United States, instead of telling us what indeed has happened in Grenada and why it sent its navy to kill the people of Grenada, has tried to gain time and to make accusations against another victim of United States policy, the people of Nicaragua. The representative of the United States has delved into psychoanalysis and history. Perhaps the Grenadian people are psychologically sick and the United States wishes to treat them with the remedy that the United States sees fit. Who is really sick: one who has megalomania and the lust for power, who sends his forces everywhere to kill the innocent? Or is it the representative here of a small nation whose people are being butchered with the most sophisticated weapons, whose only fault is the desire to build an airport and to have a government that does not please the United States?

155. I do not think this is a time for words. It is a time for deeds. I do not want to prolong this statement, as I do not want to give additional justification or more time for the United States troops to kill more people of this small nation.

156. Before concluding, I should like to read out a message addressed by the leader of our revolution to you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council and to the Secretary-General:

> "What is unfolding today in Grenada has snuffed out any hope for the peoples of small countries, such as the people of Grenada, to live free on this earth. What is taking place in Grenada is not only killing the freedom of the people of Grenada but also murdering the civilization of the 20th century. It shows that it is a fraudulent civilization.
>
> "The existence of a person like President Reagan at the helm of a super-Power is an omen of the setting back of humanity and a return to the era of barbarism, the jungle and absurdity. The civilization and freedom of mankind are in their death throes and can be salvaged only through a worldwide international alliance to confront the United States itself and to reaffirm the principles of humanity, freedom and justice in it, and to exorcize the evil spirit and nazism from it, as they have become a peril to the small nations and for international peace."

157. The delegation of my country firmly condemns this ferocious and barbaric invasion by the United States Administration against the people of the small country of Grenada. We demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the invading forces from Grenada. We call on the Council to establish a fact-finding committee, so that the facts will be crystal clear to everyone and reveal this barbaric invasion. We demand the right of indemnity for the victimized people of that small country as a result of this barbaric invasion. Finally, I call upon you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council to shoulder your responsibilities at this critical moment, because not to take any action could mean the beginning of the end of the United Nations, its Charter and its principles and could start a new phase, the phase of the law of the jungle, with the strong gobbling up the weak, and hence the end of humanity.

158. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): At this time the Security Council is convened as a matter of urgency for the consideration of an act of aggression committed by the United States against Grenada. What we have here is an open, armed interference by the huge military machine of the Pentagon against a small sovereign State of the Caribbean, a non-aligned State and Member of the United Nations. The massive invasion of the island carried out by the United States Administration is a flagrant violation of the most elementary rules of international law and the lofty principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

159. It is well known that yesterday the United States perfidiously invaded the small island State, using large con-

tingents of ground, air and naval forces. According to the information received, the overt, completely unprovoked and totally unjustified intervention against the people of Grenada involves two United States operational and tactical groups which include approximately 20 naval vessels, 90 military aircraft and more than 2000 Marines. Having been planned in advance, these operations are supported by detachments of airborne units of the United States Army. Mercenaries recruited in a number of the countries of the region are also taking part in these operations.

160. Again, for the umpteenth time, the principles of sovereignty and independence have found themselves under the heels of the United States Marines. As the basic motive for the gross military interference the United States resorted to the false excuse frequently used by Washington earlier in various parts of the world, that of the protection of American lives, although it is well known that American citizens in Grenada were not threatened with any danger. In short, the American intervention against Grenada was covered up with exactly the same excuses as the intervention of the United States against the Dominican Republic in 1965, and of course many other similar examples can also be cited.

161. Yesterday morning from the White House one could again hear the usual cynical philosophizing about the "defence of democracy", American style. As in other parts of the world where peoples are trying to follow their own independent way, the path to such "democracies", of the Samozist and Pinochet type, is opened up with the bayonets of the United States Marines. It is quite clear that the actions of Marine units and of the airborne troops are designed, first of all, to bring about a restoration of United States domination of the island and the return to power of the anti-democratic régime that has been rejected by the people. We have here an attempt by force of arms to repress the will of the people of Grenada to independence and its right to determine its fate independently.

162. It is no secret to anyone that for precisely this reason Grenada for a long time has been the object of undisguised threats and pressure on the part of Washington.

163. This new criminal act of Washington is one further element in the sharp exacerbation of tension in the whole region of Central America and the Caribbean, together with the uninterrupted military manoeuvres and unprecedented military preparations, which have been carried out for more than a year. The purpose of all of this is to repress the national liberation movements and to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign States. The direct military intervention of the American forces poses a threat to Nicaragua, by the shores of Central America, where dozens of naval vessels are standing by and military contingents of United States troops are being transferred to the countries of the region. As a result of the aggressive actions of the United States there has been a sharp deterioration in the situation in this part of the world, and international tension has risen sharply.

164. In a statement made on 28 September the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Yuri Andropov, in describing the foreign policy course of the present United States Administration, called it a militarist one which represents a grave threat to peace, the essence of which is complete disregard for the interests of other peoples and States and the attempt to secure for the United States a dominant position in the world. The aggression against Grenada is a fresh example of this.

165. The representative of the United States made a rather signficant statement by declaring the Security Council, and apparently the United Nations, to be an outdated institution. The United States, of course, is entitled to adhere to this or that opinion concerning the United Nations. We merely wish to draw attention to the fact that this terminology was used in the past as well. It was used in the 1930s when first militaristic Japan and subsequently Nazi Germany and fascist Italy were abandoning the League of Nations, declaring that institution outdated as well. They left it because they needed to have their hands free for their aggressive actions. Apparently the laurels of those régimes leave no rest to some of the people in the present Washington Administration.

166. The Soviet Union most categorically condemns the aggression of American imperialism against a small non-aligned country.

167. The Security Council has before it a matter of principle; if today, now, we do not resolutely rebuff the aggressive lawlessness of the United States, no non-aligned State, especially if it has a policy, either internal or external, not to the liking of the White House, can find itself safe.

168. The Security Council must most resolutely and in the most emphatic fashion approach the present events in Grenada. We have a deliberately planned armed invasion by the United States carried out in cold blood. The United States has brought down its military fist upon a peaceful non-aligned country. The Council is called upon most categorically to condemn the armed intervention of Washington against Grenada as an act of aggression and a violation of international peace and security—in other words, an action which is a gross violation of the Charter—and to call for the immediate withdrawal of the interventionist forces of the United States and of their vassals from the island.

169. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table.

170. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to congratulate you upon presiding over the Security Council in this difficult month and to express to you our wishes for success.

171. Some may ask, at this late hour, why the representative of Democratic Yemen, which is continents away from Grenada, comes to speak before the Security Council. The answer to this question lies in the fact that the American

navy which invaded Grenada is present in the Arab Gulf, in the Mediterranean and everywhere. Everyone realizes the danger. For this reason, we come before the Council to speak about this new invasion, which is not the first of its kind.

172. We have heard the representative of Grenada and the other members of the Council, and we have heard the facts. At this late hour, I do not want to dwell on them, yet I would like to touch upon the realities. The first reality is that there is an American invasion of Grenada. The second reality is that the United States, throughout the past four years, has tried to prevent the people of Grenada from expressing their will and from enjoying relations with all States. The third reality is that the United States for a number of years has not ceased combatting Grenada politically and economically.

173. I did not come here to discuss the number of American troops which have attacked Grenada, but I would like to draw the attention of this Council to the justifications directly or indirectly provided by the United States for this invasion.

174. In the first place, we heard a few days ago from an official source, that is, the White House, that there was no danger facing American citizens in Grenada. Less than 48 hours later—or even 24 hours later—the United States concocted a pretext, namely, that the American citizens in Grenada were facing a danger. We in Democratic Yemen are not host to any American citizens. Perhaps one of the reasons is the fear that the presence of American citizens in any country could be exploited as a ready excuse to intervene in that country.

175. Furthermore, the United States provided other pretexts through the OECS, and a declaration was issued this morning to justify its invasion. We heard the representative of Grenada refute those allegations on legal grounds. I shall now deal with the political allegations as they refer to the declaration, and I should like to raise a number of points in that respect.

176. First, the OECS declaration was used to justify the American invasion because, it was stated, the situation was deteriorating in Grenada. Who is to decide whether an internal situation in any country is deteriorating or improving? Why did the United States not intervene in Cambodia when the Pol Pot régime perpetrated the infamous massacre of more than 3 million people? That abhorrent situation required all the countries to close ranks in order to intervene and save the Cambodian people. Not one drop of blood had been shed in Grenada, certainly not the blood of any American citizen. Nevertheless, the United States felt it necessary, by referring to the OECS declaration, to claim that the situation was deteriorating.

177. Secondly, the United States has attempted to justify its interference in and invasion of Grenada by claiming that Grenada had undertaken a military buildup in such a way as to cause an upset in the balance of power in the Caribbean region. How is the international community expected to accept such grounds? Who can decide how any State can arm itself or how it should carry out its policies? Is it not the right of every State, in accordance with the Charter, to defend itself and to establish the system of its choice? We heard the allegation concerning the upsetting of the balance of power. Is it not the United States which is attempting to tilt the balance of military power in the Middle East in favour of Israel? It even boasts that arming Israel will lead to peace and security in the region. How can we accept that type of justification? What would be the fate of any State that seeks to build and defend itself?

178. Thirdly, the United States claims that by virtue of the declaration, those States, including one called Montserrat, which still has not attained independence, have sought assistance from the United States because they did not possess sufficient strength to intervene in the affairs of Grenada. How can the United States present that pretext in order to cover up its operation, a pretext which could not find any justification in other parts of the world?

179. Fourthly, the United States has attempted, by using the OECS declaration, to justify its interference in and invasion of Grenada by claiming that they were within the context of a multinational force. Does that not remind us of what is taking place in the Middle East, in general, and in Lebanon in particular? If 95 per cent of the invading force comes from the United States—the Ranger forces—what kind of multinational force could it be? That is yet another American ploy. Under the name of a multinational force, the United States is trying to camouflage its invasion of other countries. Did not the United States invade Viet Nam under the same pretext? At that time the United States said there was a multinational force in Viet Nam, whereas at the time of the final outcome it became clear that it was the United States alone that invaded Viet Nam and later bore the consequences of that invasion.

180. Fifthly, the United States has used the declaration to attempt to justify its invasion by claiming that it wished to restore normalcy in Grenada. We ask: what are normal circumstances and what are abnormal circumstances? The American invasion of the island of Grenada is the height of political and military irregularity. It indeed contravenes all international laws and norms. The political arguments used in invoking that declaration reveal the flimsy grounds upon which the United States stands. What is that normal situation to which they refer? Is there a normal situation obtaining in Montserrat, a colonized country which we shall perhaps welcome in the United Nations in a few years? Is that not an absurd situation? Decolonization is the foremost task of the United Nations. The existence of colonialism in a number of countries is indeed an example of an irregular situation. When States exercise their right to choose their own political life, that right stems from the Charter, and that situation is indeed normal.

181. Sixthly, by using that same OECS declaration the United States has sought to justify its interference in and invasion of Grenada by claiming that they are to preserve peace and security. The declaration mentions that the United States and the so-called multinational force shall remain in Grenada until stability and peace are restored.

182. How can we understand such a concept? Is it the concept which the United States has in mind when it speaks about peace-keeping and when it brings up in all the committees the need to maintain such a force, and when it states that the main purpose of the United Nations is to establish peace through peace-keeping forces which are present here and there? Is this the example we and all the other States must follow? How can we interpret the role of the so-called peace-keeping forces everywhere if this indeed is the manner in which it is implemented? If this is indeed a peace-keeping force, is it not the right of the Security Council to establish such a force in conformity with the Charter, or does every State have the right to launch invasions under such pretexts?

183. These arguments and justifications presented by the United States through the OECS declaration are the only ones. In reply to a question this afternoon concerning the reasons for America's invasion of Grenada, Secretary of State Shultz stated that the United States has intervened in order to fill a vacuum. As if Grenada floats in outer space. This theory is the very theory which has led to numerous local, regional and world wars. If this theory of filling a vacuum should reign supreme, there are many who feel that there are lacunas which indeed need to be filled. The consequences of such a policy will only lead to destruction.

184. The problem in Grenada is the result of the new American Administration's policy under the Reagan leadership. Ever since the inauguration of this Administration, unprecedented tension has grown in the international atmosphere. The Administration has sought to encourage an increase in armaments and military buildups. It has tried to impose its hegemony everywhere, to the extent that American fleets have become like Trans World Airlines—present everywhere. This policy has led to the rise in tensions which we see today in Europe. This policy has led to the intervention in the affairs of Grenada, and this policy will continue to jeopardize international peace and security.

185. These words, which are pronounced by the representative of a small country, reflect the viewpoint of many countries which deem this American invasion of a small island a sinister omen indeed.

186. Democratic Yemen calls upon the Council to condemn unequivocally this American invasion. We call for a complete withdrawal of the invading forces. And finally, we exhort you to spare no effort to put an end to this blatant aggression.

187. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The last remarks I made were by way of a right of reply. I should like now to address the issue before the Council tonight as briefly as possible, since the hour is really very late.

188. I should like first to address the question: what were the conditions which the OECS, Jamaica, Barbados and the United States felt justified the action which is being considered here tonight? Certainly, the conditions were not any sort of abstract disapproval of the Government of Prime Minister Bishop, whom we have heard extolled tonight, who had, of course, already been murdered in cold blood. We make no firm charges about who was involved in the decisions to murder Prime Minister Bishop and his ministers in cold blood, although there is suggestive information concerning those questions. The facts are that, on 13 October, Prime Minister Bishop was placed under house arrest and subsequently, on 19 October, after he had been freed by a mass demonstration of Grenadians from house arrest and surrendered to the so-called Revolutionary Council, was shot in cold blood, along with five cabinent ministers and 12 other political leaders, who were killed at roughly the same time, creating one of the bloodiest struggles for power which the world has seen in some time.

189. The second question I would like to pose and respond very briefly to is: what are the objectives that the United States has in participating in this joint action? Those objectives are clear. United States troops are involved for the purpose of protecting United States citizens, to facilitate the evacuation of those citizens who wish to leave, and to provide support for the eastern Caribbean forces as they assist the people of Grenada in restoring order and establishing functioning governmental institutions. Any continued political involvement in this cooperative effort will be guided wholly by the views of the OECS and the Government being formed in Grenada. We fully expect that the deliberations in the OAS, which are scheduled to begin tomorrow, will be constructive and may prove useful to the future of Grenada.

190. The United States was also deeply concerned in evaluating the actual and potential danger to our citizens with the existence of a shoot-on-sight curfew. The shoot-on-sight curfew which threatened anyone who was seen in the streets of Grenada was, so far as we are able to determine, certainly the primary visible act of the so-called Revolutionary Council and constituted a clear and present danger to the security, safety and well-being of, among others, the Americans who had the misfortune to be in Grenada at the time these unfortunate events occurred. Also, obviously, they constituted a clear and present danger to the well-being of the Grenadians there.

191. Briefly, I should like to address the question: what constitutes the legal basis for the United States' action?

192. We responded to an urgent appeal by the OECS for assistance. The OECS is taking an action created under the treaty establishing the organization itself and consistent with the provisions of that treaty for collective security. I would note that the OECS member States are not a party to the Rio Treaty.[1] Their own organizational treaty is in effect the regional equivalent.

193. We believe that the support by the United States of the OECS is justified on a number of grounds. The OECS determined, as I said, that conditions in institutions of authority had degenerated and that a climate of fear, anxiety and acute danger to personal safety existed on the island. The OECS determined that a dangerous vacuum of authority constituted an unprecedented threat to the peace and security of the entire eastern Caribbean. The United

States Government believed that this judgement by the OECS was accurate and justified.

194. The objectives of the collective security force organized by the OECS are, we think, equally clear. They have been stated publicly on several occasions by OECS spokesmen, and presumably will be restated here tomorrow. They have also been stated by United States Government authorities, including the President of the United States and Secretary of State Shultz today. Those objectives are: to restore law and order, to help the people of Grenada to restore functioning institutions of government, to facilitate the departure of those who leave and, most especially, to put an end to the situation of acute threat to peace and security to the entire eastern Caribbean region.

195. We believe that the action is reasonable and proportionate to the deterioration of authority in Grenada and the threat that this posed to the peace and security of the eastern Caribbean. We believe it was and is consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of American States, since it aims only at the restoration of conditions of law and order fundamental to the enjoyment of basic human rights, which were so clearly not only in jeopardy but flagrantly violated in Grenada.

196. The United States is co-operating fully with the OECS countries in seeking a meeting of the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States to review the situation. We expect, of course, to continue to co-operate with our colleagues on the Council and with the spokesmen for the OECS when they arrive here to continue this discussion tomorrow.

The meeting rose on Wednesday, 26 October, at 2.25 a.m.

NOTES

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXIII, No. 3781.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. CLXXXVIII, No. 4350.

[3] *Ibid.*, No. 4351.

[4] General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex, part II, para. (a), (c) and (e).

[5] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 21, No. 324.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-60205—April 1992—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2488th MEETING: 26 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2488)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);	
(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2488th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 26 October 1983, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan)

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2488)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);
   (*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);

(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);

(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the representative of Senegal to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Aidara (Senegal) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite Mr. Mueshihange to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mueshihange took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2481st to 2486th meetings, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Kulawiec (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Wolde (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Kunda (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Peru and the Sudan in which

they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Somogyi (Hungary), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Arias Stella (Peru) and Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The first speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. MARÍN BOSCH (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We thank the members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to participate once again in its consideration of the item on the situation in Namibia.

8. The permanency of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria is one of the issues of greatest concern to the countries of the third world, which are the very countries that feel most keenly the ominous consequences of the tension in southern Africa.

9. There has been considerable progress towards Namibian independence, both in developing and agreeing on modalities for its attainment and in identifying the artificial obstacles that have been placed in its way. In the further report on this matter submitted by the Secretary-General [*S/15943*], he stated that we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978). None the less, he also asserted that South Africa's demand that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola must be a pre-condition of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) has made it impossible to launch the United Nations plan for the exercise of self-determination by the Namibian people.

10. The contradiction between the completion of negotiations in accordance with a Security Council resolution and the creation of new prerequisites for its implementation must be declared intolerable by the Members of the Organization, otherwise decisions of a binding nature will be doomed in advance to failure and doubts will be cast on the effectiveness of the Council in fulfilling its obligations, even in cases where positions are in accord.

11. Resolutions unanimously adopted, which also have the consent of the parties directly concerned and the explicit support of the international community, cannot be called into question or subordinated in an artificial way to questions that are extraneous to their substance.

12. If new demands are acceded to or attempts made to change the very essence of the problem, countries are led to question the work of the United Nations and the commitment and sincerity of States with regard to their own decisions. It is a source of particular concern that Members that have a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security go back on their commitments.

13. There is a climate of tension in southern Africa created by the convergence of intervention, destabilization and interference, which are now also taking place in other regions of the third world.

14. The South African régime has occupied, in addition to Namibia, part of the territories of other independent countries in the region. It has invoked alleged security reasons for its actions, contending that security can be achieved through violating the integrity and sovereignty of those States with which it has ideological differences and which refuse to co-operate in the maintenance of *apartheid*.

15. Pretoria encourages and supports dissident elements in neighbouring countries and uses them to carry out destabilizing actions of sabotage and terrorism, with the intention of negotiating with the Governments concerned the suppression of movements that run counter to the South African racist policy.

16. The international community must condemn and reject new forms of interference and intervention in order to prevent them from proliferating and spreading to other regions of the third world. South Africa and its allies have imposed conditions throughout the negotiations that have been accepted by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the front-line States. However, flexibility has been interpreted as weakness, and a readiness to negotiate as a basis for additional demands.

17. The independence of Namibia is a matter of priority for the vast majority of Member States of the United Nations. Negotiations to achieve it have been long, difficult and painstaking and have required a prudent and flexible policy on the part of the people of Namibia, guided by SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. That process now seems on the verge of conclusion. It is therefore essential that we reject the imposition of new conditions, conditions that are totally extraneous to resolution 435 (1978).

18. The Council must be very clear in respect of South Africa. It must unfailingly emphasize that it cannot accept a linkage of the independence of Namibia and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, whose purposes and objectives are matters pertaining to the internal sovereignty of the countries concerned. Furthermore, Pretoria must understand that the independence of Namibia has to be obtained in the short term and that if it continues its obstruction it will be subject to mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

19. In conclusion, we appeal to the Council to act accordingly.

20. Mr. NATORF (Poland): Sir, I should like first of all to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council for the month of

October. We are firmly convinced that your able guidance, coupled with your diplomatic skill and experience, will contribute to the discharge of the responsible duties that have been vested in the Council.

21. At the same time, let me also express our appreciation and thanks to your predecessor, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana, for his wisdom and for the most efficient and exemplary manner in which he conducted the Council's business in the month of September.

22. The present debate confirms once again that, although 16 years have elapsed since South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated, we are facing the same serious problems today and the Pretoria régime still continues its illegal occupation of the Territory, violates United Nations decisions and systematically opposes all proposals for a peaceful settlement, thus taxing the patience of the whole of Africa, of the world community and of the United Nations.

23. Five years after the adoption by the Council of resolution 435 (1978), Namibia continues to remain under a colonial yoke, the United Nations plan remains unimplemented, and peace, freedom and independence for that Territory are still goals of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the non-aligned States and all progressive opinion in the world.

24. We have listened to many speakers in this debate. The overwhelming majority of them have unequivocally pointed out that the delaying tactics of the *apartheid* régime and its Western supporters have only one purpose, that of creating conditions for the continued control of the Territory by South Africa. The so-called contact group has in fact only gained time for Pretoria to strengthen its hold over Namibia. It has permitted the further exploitation of the resources of the Territory, as the *apartheid* rulers and their protectors have not abandoned their ambitions of keeping Namibia, either as a colony or as a neo-colony.

25. Therefore it is the urgent duty of the Council to adopt effective measures. The United Nations must—and I hope it will—act. That is the purpose of these meetings—to examine the most important and urgent steps to ensure independence for Namibia so that the people of the Territory can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and freedom. The Council should clearly reiterate its responsibility. We should not disappoint world opinion and dash the hopes and expectations of the Namibian people.

26. The responsibility of the Council is to make every effort towards the achievement of this goal in the shortest possible time. The Council must translate its will to implement fully its own resolutions and to set a time-limit for their implementation.

27. The Government and the people of Poland follow with deep concern the situation in and around Namibia. We consider that South Africa's military buildup and the brutal acts of armed aggression against Angola and other neighbouring countries constitute a grave danger for peace in that region. The statement by the representative of South Africa at the 2481st meeting constituted yet more arrogant evidence that nothing has changed in its approach. One can easily identify the source of that arrogance, for it stems directly from the unlimited support the South African régime receives from certain quarters, which it can always count on, even if that is not so clearly demonstrated in this chamber.

28. We read with great interest the report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 532 (1983). We took note of its conclusion that "the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan." [*Ibid., para. 25.*]

29. We flatly reject the policy of the so-called linkage. It is not and cannot be accepted. We share the views expressed by the representative of Ethiopia on behalf of the OAU, by the representative of Angola and by other speakers from the front-line and other States.

30. This is a crucial issue for the future implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Thus the Council cannot but take a clear-cut stand on it and confirm once again its unequivocal position.

31. We fully support the opinion that Council resolution 435 (1978), without any modification or qualification, is the only acceptable basis for a peaceful solution of the question of Namibia and that the independence of that Territory can be resolved only through a cessation of the illegal occupation. There should be no illusion that a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia outside the consensus contained in resolution 435 (1978) and outside the framework of the United Nations is possible.

32. We share the opinion of many speakers that, in the event of South Africa's continued defiance of United Nations decisions, the Council should consider the imposition of appropriate measures as envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Only decisive sanctions will produce the necessary results provided that they are universally and effectively implemented.

33. If the sanctions are not effective and if the United States and some other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) continue to supply weapons and war equipment to the *apartheid* régime, there will be no other way for the people of Namibia and SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, but to continue to develop the liberation struggle by all means, including armed struggle, as a legitimate way to achieve freedom and national independence. In doing so, they will have the support of all of Africa and of all progressive forces in the world.

34. There is still a chance for a negotiated peaceful solution. It is not too late to achieve this goal through the implementation of United Nations resolutions. Poland will

support the decision of the Council aimed at achieving this objective.

35. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*Interpretation from Russian*): The Council is meeting once again, at the request of the Group of African States and the non-aligned countries, to consider the question of Namibia. We welcome the participation in the work of the Council of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia, Mr. Goshu Wolde, who, on behalf of the Chairman of the OAU, has most clearly and convincingly stated the point of view of the African countries regarding the most recent course of events in Namibia.

36. The Soviet delegation also welcomes the delegation of SWAPO and its participation in the work of the Council. SWAPO has headed the struggle of patriotic forces for the liberation of Namibia from domination by the South African racists. The statement made by the Secretary for Foreign Relations of that organization, Peter Mueshihange, attests to the firm decision of the Namibian people to wage this struggle until they have completely freed their homeland from colonial and racist oppression by South Africa.

37. We have also listened most attentively to the statement made by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the representative of Zambia, Mr. Paul Lusaka, under whose leadership the Council for Namibia is making an important contribution to the cause of defending the interests of the Namibian people.

38. The state of affairs regarding the implementation of Council decisions on the granting of independence to Namibia is a cause of legitimate concern to the African countries and the majority of the States Members of the United Nations. I would say that it is a cause of concern to the entire world community. Despite numerous Security Council decisions and General Assembly resolutions, the Pretoria régime stubbornly persists in its refusal to cease its occupation of Namibia and to give its people their freedom. Moreover, year after year, the racists of South Africa continue to aggravate the situation throughout southern Africa, to extend military actions from the Territory of Namibia to Angola and wage an undeclared and continuing war against Angola, and to perpetrate constant acts of armed aggression against other African countries.

39. The recent piratical raid by South Africans against Mozambique is yet one more link in a long chain of crimes committed by the racist régime against independent Africa. Speaking here on 21 October [*2482nd meeting, para. 83*], the representative of Mozambique stated that it was not only the right but also the duty of his Government to take all necessary measures to preserve Mozambique's national independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty. He expressed the view that the members of the Council should take note of that statement. I assure the representative of Mozambique that his statement did not pass unnoticed.

40. The racists are making a serious mistake if they are banking on the fact that history and the peoples of Africa will forgive them for this blanket use of arbitrary will towards their neighbours. It is now perfectly clear to everyone that the Pretoria régime is not merely an outpost of colonialism and racism in southern Africa but also the source of an ever-greater danger to international peace and security.

41. Seventeen years have already passed since the moment when the General Assembly demanded that South Africa unconditionally—I stress "unconditionally"—free Namibia. During these long years—long, above all, for the long-suffering people of Namibia—South Africa, relying on support from the United States and several other NATO countries, but mainly from the United States, has done all in its power to block the process of decolonization for Namibia. One has to be incredibly naive to believe seriously the claim that Pretoria alone is able to resist the will of the entire world community and to act in such a provocative and aggressive manner towards other African countries from a position of strength, an attitude we observed here last week in the Council during the statement of the South African representative. The representative of South Africa was very frank in dotting all his i's. He reaffirmed his position in favour of that notorious linkage, challenged the Council, and rejected in advance any possible decisions that would set a timetable for the implementation of a solution to the Namibian conflict.

42. Behind the arrogance of the racist régime is the powerful support of its friends and allies—who are as much the enemies of national liberation movements in Africa and throughout the world as are the South African racists.

43. During the process of sabotaging a settlement of the question of Namibia, which has gone on for many years now, the opponents of Namibian independence have a definite distribution of roles: Pretoria refuses to implement United Nations decisions and is waging an undeclared war against its neighbours, while the United States and several other Western Powers do not allow the adoption against South Africa of effective sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and try to gain time by asserting that they will be able to persuade the Pretoria régime to grant independence to Namibia through peaceful means.

44. For all these 17 years, the African countries and the entire world have heard optimistic and endless variations by the United States and other Western Powers on the theme that the goal is already in sight, that the Africans need to be more patient, make yet a few more concessions to Pretoria, remove a few more obstacles in the path of a settlement of the problem of Namibia with South Africa. Only the day before yesterday the Council once again heard the honeyed assurances that the United States is rendering assistance to the parties in implementing resolution 435 (1978) and eliminating obstacles to its implementation; we also heard appeals to show good will and redouble efforts, and so forth. Are we really going to be listening to those statements for another 17 years? It is clear that all the promises and forced optimism are nothing but a smoke-screen, just an attempt to deceive, with the aim of delaying for entire decades the granting of independence to Namibia.

45. Moreover, the Western Powers do not want to hear anything about the application of any sanctions whatever against South Africa—although in recent times sanctions have become a popular measure in United States foreign policy. The present United States Administration is ready to threaten anyone with sanctions, even certain members of the Council, if they do not vote as Washington wishes. The proper term for that is blackmail. But any compulsory measures to be applied against Pretoria only have to be mentioned to be immediately subjected to a taboo.

46. In refusing to grant independence to Namibia and stepping up military pressure on independent States of southern Africa, Pretoria and Washington are trying to hide their anti-African policy with fabrications to the effect that the conflict around Namibia represents a confrontation between the East and the West. This is a propaganda screen and nothing more, intended to create an excuse for interference by the United States in the affairs of that region and ensure its strategic interests there, to the detriment of the national interests of the African countries. In fact the problem of Namibia represents a conflict between South Africa and the United States and the Western Powers of NATO which support them, on the one hand, and the people of Namibia and of independent African countries, on the other. It is a conflict between the national liberation movement of southern Africa and the united forces of imperialism and racism.

47. If during the first stages of this dubious game with Namibia the Western Powers, hiding behind the role of intermediaries, still referred to the uncompromising nature of South Africa, in recent times Washington has ripped off that mask and is right now itself trying to achieve a link between the settlement of the Namibian question and the unrelated question of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, which are there at the request of the Angolan Government under an agreement between Angola and Cuba.

48. This illegal demand of Washington and Pretoria has obvious objectives in mind, namely, to block the settlement of the Namibian question, to weaken Angola through military threats made by the South African aggressors and to limit the sovereign rights of Angola, including its inalienable right to self-defence, a right guaranteed to it under Article 51 of the Charter.

49. The representatives of African countries who have spoken in the Council have rightly revealed the true motives and the underlying reasons of this policy of the United States, which has made Namibia hostage to its imperialist ambitions on the African continent. They condemned and rejected any and all attempts by South Africa and the United States to link, in direct form or within the context of so-called parallelism, the independence of Namibia with any other unrelated questions whatever and, *inter alia*, with the question of the presence of Cuban internationalists in Angola.

50. This position is supported by the overwhelming majority of the States of the world. It has been reflected in decisions of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983 [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I*], and also in decisions of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU and in the statement of the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, which took place here at United Nations Headquarters at the beginning of this month [*see S/16035, annex*].

51. Now this position of the world community must be clearly and unambiguously reflected in a decision of the Security Council, which this time also is obliged to make its authoritative voice heard so as to arrive at a speedy and unconditional decolonization of Namibia.

52. Our delegation believes that the proposal of the African countries, too, is correct regarding the establishment in a decision by the Council of a strict time-frame for starting implementation of a settlement of the Namibian question.

53. These provisions will be a useful addition to the well-known position of the United Nations regarding a settlement in Namibia which is determined by decisions taken on Namibia as a whole. It is precisely in these decisions of the United Nations, above all in Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), that we have the political basis for a just settlement of the Namibian problem.

54. The adoption by the Council in May of this year of resolution 532 (1983) was yet another step in the right direction, and this resolution, and in particular the mandate given in it to the Secretary-General, created specific machinery to move forward a settlement of the Namibian question.

55. The present consideration by the Council of the question of Namibia is called on to strengthen and continue this positive process. It is necessary in the future, as well, to strengthen the role of the United Nations in settling the Namibian question by providing for effective control by the Council over implementation of all aspects of granting Namibia genuine independence, including, of course, the questions of the training, composition, leadership, deployment and activities of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia.

56. In speaking of all these matters, we cannot, however, rid ourselves of the impression that, as far as a settlement of the Namibian problem is concerned, the Council is beginning to go round in a circle or, more precisely, it has been led into that position by some of the Western Powers. To enable the Council to escape from this circle, South Africa must be forced to take into account the will of the Council through the adoption of compulsory measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, and for these purposes it is necessary to overcome the resistance of those Western Powers permanent members of the Council which are blocking this and defending the racist régime from any kind of effective international sanctions. It is not easy to do this, but it must be done in the interest of liberating Namibia and of preserving international peace.

57. The Soviet Union supports the demands of the African countries regarding the adoption by the Council of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, to force the régime of Pretoria to cease its illegal occupation of Namibia and to halt acts of aggression by the racists against African States.

58. Our country favours the speedy realization by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, and the immediate and complete withdrawal from Namibia of the troops and administration of South Africa.

59. The Soviet Union has rendered and will continue to render support in the just struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO.

60. Mr. van der STOEL (Netherlands): In May of this year, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 532 (1983) on the question of Namibia, which, among other things, authorized the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties to the proposed cease-fire—South Africa and SWAPO—with a view to securing the speedy implementation of the United Nations independence plan for Namibia approved by resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General's report is now before the Council [*S/15943*]. Once again it falls to us, members of the Council, to assess the situation as outlined in the report and, conscious of our special and unique responsibility for Namibia and the aspirations for peace, justice and independence harboured by its people, to decide on the action to be taken in the light of the Secretary-General's findings.

61. The Namibian problem has been before the United Nations virtually since the inception of the Organization. In fact, Namibia has been an acknowledged international responsibility for more than 60 years, first as a mandated Territory of the League of Nations, then as a Territory under the lawful administration of the United Nations. In 1966, the General Assembly revoked South Africa's Mandate and placed Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], an action that was consequently confirmed and endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 245 (1968) and by the International Court of Justice.[1] Yet South Africa simply ignored the verdict of these three United Nations bodies and continued its illegal occupation of the Territory in defiance of the international community and world opinion.

62. It is a source of deep regret and anger to my Government that, while the Namibian people continue their interminable wait for independence, negotiations that should lead to an internationally acceptable solution in accordance with resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) seem to be endlessly protracted. Now, as in May, my Government feels justified in questioning South Africa's readiness to co-operate in good faith with the United Nations in enabling the people of Namibia freely to determine their own future and granting them their long overdue independence. What is needed now is a firm expression by South Africa of its willingness to carry out the Council's resolutions, without any further pre-conditions, as concrete proof of its good intentions.

63. Only such an assurance, followed by practical steps towards a solution, could remove the widespread suspicion that South Africa is merely playing for time.

64. We owe the Secretary-General and his Special Representative for Namibia, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, a heartfelt tribute for the highly skilful way in which they try to carry out the difficult mandate conferred on them. The Secretary-General's latest report bears eloquent testimony to his constant and intense personal involvement in the quest for a settlement and to the prominent place the question of Namibia rightly occupies in his order of priorities. Feeling that he should leave no stone unturned where the right of Namibia's people to independence is concerned, the Secretary-General this summer decided, after careful consideration, to pay a short working visit to South Africa to discuss the two remaining issues: the choice of an electoral system and a few points pertaining to UNTAG. As his consultations with the South African Government resulted in agreement on these two outstanding issues, the Secretary-General rightly concluded in his report that "we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)." [*S/15943, para. 24.*]

65. As we all know, the latest delay in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) was not caused by any fundamental disagreement on the details of the settlement plan. In the summer of 1982, as the consultations between the parties were nearing their completion, South Africa raised a new obstacle by making its final approval conditional on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The Organization thus faces a grave dilemma. As the Secretary-General pointed out to the South African side, the so-called linkage issue falls outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978). We fully share this view. It is clearly unacceptable that the early exercise by the Namibian people of their internationally recognized and inalienable right to self-determination and independence should be impeded because of the situation in a neighbouring country. This would be incompatible with the legal responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia and with the general recognition that the independence of Namibia is the essential and primary issue, which must necessarily take precedence over other considerations. Yet, on the other hand, none of us would wish to jeopardize the substantial progress which has so far been achieved, thanks to the tenacious work of the many parties involved, by allowing the process to be side-tracked, or even derailed, because of extraneous aspects.

66. My Government feels that once an independent Namibia has taken its rightful place among the free nations of Africa and the threat of South African aggression against Angola has disappeared, the withdrawal of foreign troops from that State would increase regional security. Indeed, there seems some merit in the view that the parties concerned might wish to attain a common understanding on

this and other issues relevant to the stability of the region as a whole in the situation prevailing after Namibia's attainment of independence. I repeat, however, that these issues should not deflect us from our primary responsibility—that is, to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination without further delay.

67. The Secretary-General pointed out in his report that we cannot claim real progress until an actual date is fixed for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the cease-fire comes into force. And, sounding a grave warning, he added that "further disastrous consequences will result if we do not reach this stage quickly." [*Ibid., para. 28.*]

68. My Government fully subscribes to the Secretary-General's assessment of the calamitous situation that will engulf the entire area if the present stalemate is allowed to persist. In our view there can be no doubt that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia is part of a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security. How seriously this threat must be taken is vividly illustrated by South Africa's constant military incursions into Angola and the attempts at destabilization and intimidation that have come to characterize South Africa's relations with its neighbours. We strongly condemn these acts of aggression, which are obviously meant to punish these countries for their steadfast opposition to South African *apartheid* policies and their insistence that South Africa comply with the Council resolutions on Namibia.

69. It is imperative, therefore, that South Africa be called upon to desist from attacking its neighbours and to agree to a cease-fire as a first, urgent step to improve the security of all nations in the region. This might in its turn contribute to the creation of an atmosphere conducive to a breakthrough in the present impasse. Modest as such a step may seem against the background of the long and frustrating delays that occurred in past years, it nevertheless might be helpful in getting things moving again in the right direction. Failing this, the Council is duty-bound to consider appropriate means of applying further pressure to South Africa to comply with the Council's previous resolutions.

70. Clearly, the prestige of the United Nations is at stake. In view of the United Nations' special responsibility for Namibia and its long history of involvement in efforts to enable its people freely to exercise their right to self-determination, a smooth transfer of power in Windhoek under the aegis of the United Nations would be an important boost for the Organization and a victory for international co-operation. If the lost impetus is restored and meaningful negotiations are resumed by building on the solid foundations already laid, this will undoubtedly enhance the credibility of the United Nations and redound to its effectiveness in dealing with other areas. Perhaps it is not yet too late, but if we wish to avoid being overtaken by events that could undo what progress has been made over the past years we should join hands now in concerted, decisive action. Only this will convince the Namibian people and the world community that the Council is united in its commitment to the establishment of an independent Namibia at the earliest possible date and in its determination to overcome the remaining obstacles standing in the way of the attainment of this goal.

71. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

72. Mr. PELLETIER (Canada): Mr. President, I am most grateful to you and to the Council for again giving my country an opportunity to participate in this debate. The situation in Namibia is of concern to us all, not least to those of us in the front-line States and the contact group that have worked to change it. The situation affects the people of Namibia, who have an unquestioned right to freedom and self-determination. It affects the countries of Africa, which have worked hard for Namibia's independence. Further delay is in no one's interest. I am confident, Mr. President, that, with your experience and understanding, you will lead the Council towards a positive result that hastens the day when Namibia will be free.

73. The members of the contact group have consistently supported applications from persons competent for the purpose who have requested the opportunity to speak at Council meetings concerning the situation in Namibia, in order to supply the Council with information on this question in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. Contact group members have done so without passing any judgement on the opinions expressed by those persons. They consider it important that the Council, which by its previous decisions has engaged itself to seek the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia, should provide, on an impartial basis, opportunities to those who may be parties to those elections to present their views. In this context, the members of the contact group are transmitting messages from two internal parties.

74. Canada helped to initiate and to frame the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia in 1978. My Government deeply regrets that the Council is still seized of this issue five years later. The people of Namibia are still unable to exercise their right to self-determination. We understand and share the concerns of the international community which have prompted the call for the Council to meet.

75. The road to the peaceful independence of Namibia has not been straight or smooth. We have found many pot-holes and some major road-blocks. Occasionally the road has seemed to wind backwards. Sometimes we have feared that the road might end short of Namibia's independence, but we have made progress. It is in this context that I should like to join other speakers in complimenting the Secretary-General on his recent efforts to restore momentum towards the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978).

76. By its resolution 532 (1983), the Council mandated the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties to the proposed cease-fire, with a view to securing the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). His subsequent efforts, as outlined in his report [*S/15943*], reflect more than just one visit to southern

Africa. They reflect a continuing commitment on the part of the Secretary-General and his staff to this just cause.

77. In his report, the Secretary-General has outlined his discussions both before and during his visit to southern Africa. These discussions demonstrated the Secretary-General's commitment to carry out faithfully and conscientiously the mandate entrusted to him by the Council last May.

78. We welcome the assurances from the Government of South Africa that the choice of electoral system, whether proportional representation or the constituency system, would be made and would be communicated at an early stage in the implementation process. That is essential to the success of the United Nations plan. We are glad that agreement has been reached on the proposed composition of UNTAG and that the remaining questions regarding its status have been settled. We believe, in addition, that the Secretary-General's assurances that all parties would be treated equally in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have effectively resolved this matter. We also note the positive statement that the President of SWAPO made to the Secretary-General. We welcome the co-operation of all parties involved in these discussions and these important steps forward.

79. Now that the outstanding issues under resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved, the question is: Where do we go from here? My Government hopes that the Secretary-General will have the opportunity to build constructively on his recent success. We believe that he should be free to use all the means at his disposal to pursue early independence for Namibia and thereby to foster peace and stability in southern Africa. To this end, we would strongly urge that unrealistic deadlines be avoided while seeking implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in 1984.

80. The question of peace and stability in the region is important. My Government fully shares the concerns expressed by the Secretary-General in his report. The instability and conflict arising from South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia have had disastrous consequences for Namibia and its neighbours. Measures to build confidence and to reduce conflict in the region are urgently needed. We would support initiatives to that end for, as the Secretary-General has said, "it is in the interest of absolutely no one to have this situation continue." [*Ibid., para. 27.*]

81. It is important that the Government of South Africa recognize this basic fact. Just days before this debate, South African troops again violated the sovereignty of Mozambique. We condemn that attack in Maputo. We also condemn acts of violence or terrorism wherever they may occur.

82. South Africa cannot seek, through its use of force, unilaterally to reshape the region. Boundaries and sovereignties must remain inviolate. That is the only basis for peace in the region. The President of Angola has reaffirmed that his country has no desire to rely on foreign troops or to keep them on its soil once Angola is no longer threatened. The first step toward a settlement must surely be the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola. Their presence there cannot be justified in terms of international law and practice.

83. The Secretary-General has noted that South Africa continues to make the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola a condition for its withdrawal from Namibia. South Africa cannot, however, legitimize its illegal occupation of Namibia by raising other issues. As the Canadian Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs stated in his speech to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, Namibia should have its independence regardless of what happens or does not happen in Angola.[2]

84. Canada admires the patience of those leaders in the region who have worked so hard for so long for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We take their patience and their dogged persistence as our own example. We shall not cease our efforts. The implementation of resolution 435 (1978) during 1984 must be our objective and that of the Council.

85. We have come a long way since 1978. Unfortunately, we still have some distance to go. I hope that the Council's deliberations will lead to practical steps to strengthen confidence in the region and hasten Namibia's independence. Its independence is no dream; it is inevitable reality. Our goal must be to ensure that this independence comes soon and peacefully.

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

87. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, Mr. President, my delegation wishes to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October, since you represent a country with which Argentina has very cordial relations. We are convinced that the Council will be able to accomplish fruitful work on the question of Namibia under your leadership, thanks to your acknowledged experience and reputation. We should like to express our delegation's readiness to co-operate with you in every way.

88. The Council is once again considering the question of Namibia, the rapid, just and final solution of which, through the authentic exercise of the right to self-determination and independence of the Namibian people, is called for by the overwhelming majority of the international community.

89. A short time ago, the Council adopted resolution 532 (1983), which called upon South Africa to make a firm commitment as to its readiness to comply with Council resolution 435 (1978); the resolution further called upon the Pretoria Government to co-operate forthwith and fully with the Secretary-General in order to expedite the imple-

mentation of resolution 435 (1978) for the early independence of Namibia.

90. These provisions of resolution 532 (1983) reflect a virtually universal consensus that this manifestation of anachronistic and unjust colonialism in southern Africa must disappear once and for all. International justice, peace and security must be established in that part of the world and, in particular, in Namibia.

91. Argentina, associating itself with the opinion of the large majority of Members of the Organization, has pointed out that the independence of Namibia, with full enjoyment of territorial integrity and an authentically representative Government, will be the fundamental contribution to that much-desired peace and development in southern Africa.

92. The Secretary-General, who has made very valuable efforts towards the implementation of Council resolutions 435 (1978), 439 (1978) and 532 (1983), clearly pointed out in his report that "we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)." [*Ibid., para. 24.*]

93. Argentina, in view of the situation I have just described, wishes to reaffirm its traditional position and to point out that the establishment of Namibia as a sovereign and completely independent State will only be possible on the following bases: first, Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), which form the legitimate framework for a peaceful transition to the independence of Namibia; secondly, full respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, in accordance with Security Council resolution 432 (1978) and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly; thirdly, the rejection of any link or condition imposed by South Africa and not contained in resolution 435 (1978); fourthly, support for the action of the front-line States and SWAPO; and fifthly, cessation by South Africa of its policies of intimidation, aggression and illegal military occupation carried out against the neighbouring States, in particular, against Angola, Mozambique and Lesotho.

94. As was pointed out by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Worship of my country in a statement before the General Assembly on 26 September 1983, Argentina fully agrees with the Secretary-General that no real progress can be made until a precise date is set for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and a cease-fire enters into force.[3]

95. Therefore, my delegation is convinced that the Council should assume its primary responsibility concerning the prompt implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and, if necessary, apply all relevant measures, including those contained in Chapter VII of the Charter, so that the genuine and complete independence of Namibia may be attained as soon as possible.

96. Colonialism and any other form of foreign domination affecting international justice and dignity must be eliminated without further delay. It is for this reason that Argentina pledges its support for all the efforts of the Organization to ensure that the Namibian people may promptly enjoy their well-deserved freedom and justice.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is Mr. Johnstone F. Makatini, representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

98. Mr. MAKATINI: Mr. President, I wish to thank you most sincerely for giving us the opportunity to participate in this Council meeting. Our thanks also go to all the members of this body for making this possible. Like many representatives who have preceded us, we are pleased to see you preside over the Council when it examines once again the problem to which the African people and justice-loving people as a whole attach so much importance. Your country's commitment to the international fight for freedom, justice and peace in the Middle East and southern Africa is well known, as is your own personal devotion to these just causes. This double qualification and your rich diplomatic experience inspire us with confidence that, under your able guidance, the deliberations of the Council will be crowned with success.

99. May I also, in the name of the National Executive Committee of ANC, pay tribute to my friend, brother and comrade, Mr. Noel Sinclair, for what everybody agrees was the outstanding leadership he provided to the Council during the difficult month of September. The role played by Guyana and a host of other countries that provide international front-line support in the fight against the inhuman system of *apartheid* is a source of tremendous inspiration and encouragement to our people.

100. Having failed to secure the intended annexation and incorporation of Namibia as a fifth province of South Africa and contesting the legal authority of the United Nations on this question, the Pretoria régime defiantly imposed its illegal occupation of this African territory some decades ago. This was followed by countless resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice and other international institutions, condemning racist South Africa's illegal occupation and calling for its termination. The international community also went further and recognized SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

101. The Pretoria régime's response to this consensus was continued defiance, thereby forcing SWAPO to resort to armed struggle. In 1977, at a time when the development of the armed liberation struggle waged by the heroic people of Namibia, under their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, had reached a high point, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany came forward and offered their services as a contact group which would use its collective diplomatic and economic leverage to coerce racist South Africa to co-operate towards a negotiated settlement of the

Namibian problem. SWAPO, together with the front-line States and Nigeria, were to become participants in this exercise.

102. That SWAPO, the front-line States and Nigeria were suspicious is common knowledge. For our part, we of ANC fully shared this suspicion. The cause of this strong suspicion was mainly the fact that all the members of the proposed contact group were countries that had done everything possible, short of direct military intervention in support of the *apartheid* régime, to thwart the Namibian people's liberation struggle.

103. What had brought about this change of heart? many asked. Was it the development of the struggle, led by SWAPO, which was progressively making the Namibian war of liberation unstoppable, as the ANC struggle intensified in South Africa itself? What was the group's hidden agenda? others asked. Was it the derailment of this liberation struggle and the imposition of a neo-colonialist solution in Namibia?

104. More questions came up. Was this initiative intended to help the Pretoria régime buy the time it needed to set up and consolidate a third-force group in preparation for a solution of its choosing—that is, the exclusion of SWAPO and the imposition of a puppet neo-colonialist régime in Namibia? Were these negotiations to be held with the illegal occupier of Namibia simply intended to put an end to the confrontational posture that had been taken by the international community against racist South Africa and to help rehabilitate that régime—a régime that stood universally condemned for its practice of the inhuman system of *apartheid*?

105. These questions have become pertinent in the face of not only the failure of the contact group to deliver what it promised but also the attitude, pronouncements and acts of solidarity displayed by the United States, the leader of the group, towards the *apartheid* régime.

106. We are convinced that the Pretoria régime is bent on perpetuating its illegal occupation of Namibia or imposing its own solution, in keeping with its determination to prevent the completion of the process through which neighbouring countries became independent and ceased to serve as buffer zones. Its policy of destabilization and aggression against the front-line States and Lesotho is in fact further proof of its intention to reverse this situation, which had resulted in the independence of Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Angola and extended the frontiers of freedom to this last bastion of reaction on the African continent.

107. The propaganda campaign which accompanied the emergence of the Western contact group and the big promises that diplomatic and economic leverage would be collectively exerted on the Pretoria régime in order to force its hand tell the rest of the story.

108. A campaign was unleashed not only criticizing the countries that had always supported SWAPO and other liberation movements as interfering, but also claiming that the United States and other contact group members considered the mineral resources with which Namibia and South Africa itself were endowed to be of vital strategic interest to the United States. Although we remain convinced that the motive for setting up the contact group in 1977 was the determination to obstruct the outright victory that had become imminent in Zimbabwe and inevitable in Namibia, it is true that there were some positive elements. For example, we welcomed what we thought was the beginning of some movement towards recognizing the fact that the liberation struggle in southern Africa was indigenous and not an extension of East-West rivalry.

109. But the change in Washington and the assumption of leadership by the present Administration have resulted in the cancellation of the limited positive elements and the multiplication of the negative elements. While professing its commitment to the liberation of Namibia, the Reagan Administration has shamelessly proclaimed friendship and alliance with the racist oppressor, to which it has offered nuclear, dollar and other types of carrots, and has pledged to reward countries that befriend their racist ally and punish or topple those that give assistance to SWAPO and ANC.

110. This Pretoria-Washington unholy alliance has encouraged the *apartheid* régime's intransigence, repression, terrorism, destabilization and aggression in Namibia and South Africa and against the front-line States and Lesotho.

111. The linkage issue introduced by the United States is the most flagrant act of hostility against the liberation cause of Africa and the international community. Unfolding events have in fact shown that it is but the starting-point of a long chain of other so-called linkages intended to impede the liberation of southern Africa and strengthen the political, economic and military position of the Pretoria régime as the bastion, gendarme and strategic ally in the region of the United States of the Reagan Administration. Part of this strategy has taken the form of economic blackmail and the use of armed bandits, who serve as the extension of the régime's racist army in carrying out acts of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring States.

112. As a result, we find that the posture adopted by the *apartheid* régime with regard to the independent African States of southern Africa is governed today by the promotion of what Pretoria describes as its policy of national security. Indeed, this policy constitutes the centre-piece of Pretoria's strategy for the defence and entrenchment of the *apartheid* system.

113. In accordance with this policy, the régime seeks to destroy SWAPO and ANC in Namibia and South Africa, and it has examples to learn from as it continues its activities in the direction of a Beirut-type operation in southern Africa.

114. The second component of this strategy is the transformation of the rest of the region into a so-called constellation of client States under its domination. Again the central element of the strategy is the liquidation of

SWAPO and ANC even outside the borders of the respective countries, or at least our eviction from the region. In pursuance of this strategy, the Pretoria régime is bent on a campaign of terror, aggression and destabilization which we are convinced will only stop when the Council takes effective action or when the régime feels it has pacified the whole region.

115. This position of the Washington Administration is taken, for example, by the United States Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Mr. Lawrence Eagleburger, who stated that the efforts to secure a negotiated settlement in Namibia must also address racist South Africa's so-called legitimate security concerns. This, we submit, is a creeping move towards campaigning for the liquidation of ANC in the region, as yet another linkage.

116. The statement of the United States representative before the Council at the 2484th meeting, on 24 October, is yet another example. And so is the statement of the Pretoria régime's representative, at the 2481st meeting, to whom the simple discovery of a pamphlet during its unprovoked aggression in Maputo, a pamphlet that talks of ANC soldiers, justifies the régime's aggression against the capital of Mozambique.

117. Perhaps the most central part of the Reagan Administration's policy and strategy of so-called constructive engagement is helping to placate world public opinion and giving credibility to racist South Africa in its pretence of engaging in peaceful talks, thus helping that régime to buy time and prepare for the imposition of a neo-colonialist settlement in Namibia. Evidence on the ground also shows that part of this strategy is not only the destabilization of the front-line States but also the toppling of their legitimate Governments. We seize this opportunity to pay a tribute to those countries for the sacrifice they are making in resisting the combined pressure of the United States and racist South Africa, designed to force them to enter into secret agreements for the liquidation of ANC and the liberation struggle in South Africa.

118. It is clear that an honest examination of the situation can only lead to the following conclusions.

119. The negotiated settlement has never been, and is not today, around the corner, as some have been saying for a number of years now. There has been no substantial progress in that direction, and none can be made in the face of the anti-African-liberation position of the Pretoria régime and its Washington allies. Implementation of the United Nations plan can be achieved only through forcing racist South Africa to withdraw unconditionally from Namibia and not through persuasion. Continued delay by the Council in taking this position and imposing sanctions will not only erode the authority of the United Nations but make it an accomplice in the crimes yet to be committed by the *apartheid* régime. We therefore call for the immediate imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime and appeal to the other members of the contact group to condemn the issue of linkage and publicly to dissociate themselves from that position.

120. In conclusion I wish to pay a glowing tribute to the valiant people of Namibia, whose patience, perseverance and fortitude, combined with the yet unsung political maturity acquired in the course of the bitter struggle they have been waging for so long under the far-sighted leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, has enabled them to defeat the countless machinations and manoeuvres designed to derail their heroic struggle and pave the way for a new colonialist solution.

121. Through Comrade Peter Mueshihange, through the People's Liberation Army of Namibia and the SWAPO Central Committee, headed by the indomitable Comrade Sam Nujoma, we salute our comrades-in-arms, the people of Namibia, for the important victories they continue to win in both the political and the military fields.

122. We dip our banner in memory of those who have fallen in battle or as victims of massacres and assassinations perpetrated by the Pretoria régime while we are being told in the Council that our frustrations are shared by the mighty ones.

123. We salute the SWAPO leadership, and pledge to reciprocate the support the Namibian people have always given our struggle by intensifying ours in the belly of the *apartheid* beast, thereby complementing yours and bringing closer our inevitable common victories.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 8th meeting, para. 42.

[3] *Ibid.*, 6th meeting, para. 77.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—April 1992—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2489th MEETING: 26 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2489) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in Grenada:
Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067) ... 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2489th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 26 October 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2489)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in Grenada:
   Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067).

The meeting was called to order at 4.55 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Grenada:
Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at its 2487th meeting, I invite the representative of Grenada to take a place at the Council table, and I invite the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico and Venezuela to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jacobs (Grenada), took a place at the Council table; Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico) and Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Dominica, Ethiopia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Seychelles, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Jacobs (Antigua and Barbuda), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Gumucio Granier (Bolivia), Mr. Baron (Dominica), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Richardson (Jamaica), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. St. Aimee (Saint Lucia), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Hoang Bich Son (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): Members of the Council have before them document S/16077, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Guyana and Nicaragua. I have been asked to announce that Zimbabwe has joined in sponsoring this draft resolution.

4. The first speaker is the Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs of the Commonwealth of Dominica and Chairperson of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, Miss Eugenia Charles. On behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to her and invite her to make her statement.

5. Miss CHARLES (Dominica): I wish most sincerely to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members for granting me this opportunity to address the Council. The matter before the Council is one of great importance to us in our part of the world, but we know that you, Mr. President, have a great deal of experience dealing with these matters and we are quite sure that you will bring your wisdom and patience to bear so that the matter may be brought to a final conclusion, taking into consideration all the points that will be made and understanding the degree of anxiety in the minds of those of us who belong to the eastern Caribbean States.

6. The member Governments of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)—Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Montserrat—met at Bridgetown, Barbados, on Friday, 21 October 1983, to consider and evaluate the situation in Grenada arising out

of the overthrow and subsequent killing of the Prime Minister, together with some of his cabinet colleagues and a number of other citizens. The member States were deeply concerned that this situation would continue to worsen, that there would be further loss of life, personal injury and a general deterioration of public order as the military group in control attempted to secure its position.

7. Member Governments considered that the subsequent imposition of a draconian 96-hour curfew by the military group in control was intended to allow them to suppress further the population of Grenada, which had shown by numerous demonstrations their hostility to this group. The member Governments noted that the present régime in Grenada had demonstrated by its brutality and ruthlessness that it would stop at nothing to achieve its ends and to secure its power.

8. Member Governments have also been greatly concerned that the extensive military buildup in Grenada over the last few years had created a situation of disproportionate military strength between Grenada and the OECS countries. This military might in the hands of the present group has posed a serious threat to the security of the OECS countries and other neighbouring States. The member States were deeply concerned that military forces and supplies were likely to be introduced shortly to consolidate the position of the régime and that the country could be used as a staging-post for acts of aggression against them, and they further noted that the capability of the Grenada armed forces is already at a level of sophistication and size far beyond the internal needs of that country. Furthermore, the member States of the OECS have no means of defence against such forces. Member Governments considered it of the utmost urgency that immediate steps should be taken to remove these threats.

9. I shall share with you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council something which I was not in a position to make public before. The Governor-General in fact had requested assistance. Earlier, the Governor-General was in a position where we were not able, for security reasons, to make reference to this. Now that we have word that he is completely safe, we feel it is fair to share this with the Council.

10. Under the provisions of article 8 of the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, concerning defence and security in the sub-region, member Governments of OECS decided to take appropriate action, since such a situation would further undermine political, social and economic stability and would have extremely dangerous consequences for the preservation of peace and security in the OECS sub-region as a whole. Bearing in mind the relative lack of military resources in the possession of the other OECS countries, the member Governments have sought assistance for this purpose from friendly countries within the region and subsequently from outside.

11. Three Governments have responded to the OECS member Governments' request to form a multinational force for the purpose of undertaking a pre-emptive defensive strike in order to remove this dangerous threat to peace and security to their sub-region and to establish a situation of normalcy in Grenada. These Governments are Barbados, Jamaica and the United States of America. Barbados and Jamaica are members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and Barbados is linked to some of the OECS member Governments in a sub-regional security agreement.

12. It is the intention of the member Governments of the OECS that, once the threat has been removed, they will invite the Governor-General of Grenada to assume executive authority of the country under the provisions of the Grenada Constitution of 1973 and to appoint a broad-based interim Government to administer the country pending the holding of general elections. It is anticipated that general elections could be held six months after normalcy has been restored.

13. It has been agreed that, while these arrangements are being put in place, the presence of former Prime Minister Eric Gairy and other undesirable political elements would complicate the situation and that they would therefore not be welcome in Grenada.

14. It is further intended that arrangements should be made to establish effective police and peace-keeping forces in order to restore and maintain law and order in the country. We have already begun talks with persons in the Commonwealth to see if they would take part in the peace-keeping force, and as soon as there are sufficient of them agreeable to doing so we would ensure the immediate withdrawal of all forces, even Caribbean forces which have taken part in the action. After normalcy has been restored, non-Caribbean forces will withdraw from Grenada. Member Governments of the OECS wish to solicit the diplomatic support of all friendly countries for this initiative.

15. Mr. UMBA di LUTETE (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): It is not without emotion that, in the name of my delegation, I address the Council on the question under discussion. There is always emotion and indignation over the death of men, of innocent people, over the violation of the elementary principles on which international relations are based, and over the violation of international law.

16. Non-aggression and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States is one of the principles of international law. That is why Zaire, my country, has always condemned aggression and *coups*, whatever their origin. Therefore, when similar problems have come before the Council or other forums, problems such as that of the aggression against Chad and that of the South Korean civil aircraft, Zaire has not failed to condemn those acts. Unfortunately, we must note that the Council has remained strangely silent. As I said in my statement to the Council on Monday [*2483rd meeting*], by its passivity and even its division the Council sometimes rewards force and violations of the Charter.

17. The time has come for the Council to assure us that henceforth it will not fail to condemn interference in the internal affairs of States, thus putting an end to its present

policy. In other words, we must always abide by principles, and not look at the individual involved. Whatever happens, Zaire cannot support acts of aggression and violations of the Charter, wherever they may come from.

18. That is why my delegation is happy, though also surprised, that those who yesterday refused, on the basis of fallacious pretexts, to condemn past aggression are today asking the Council to condemn acts which we deplore and disapprove of today. In order to protest this ambivalence on the part of certain States and the Council, my delegation, while disapproving of the use of force—I repeat, wherever it may come from—will reject aggression on all sides, by those States which violate the Charter and those which have divided the world between themselves into exclusive zones of influence and which, despite various charades which cannot deceive us, come to understandings in the corridors.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

20. Mr. HOANG BICH SON (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): First, Sir, I congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and on all the efforts you have made to serve the cause of peace and stability throughout the world. I thank all members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to state Viet Nam's position on the burning issue which is before the Council.

21. The whole world is examining with extreme disquiet the situation in Central America and the Caribbean, a situation fraught with dangerous tensions likely to kindle an explosion because of the hostile and aggressive activities of the United States against Nicaragua, Cuba, Grenada and the people of El Salvador. International opinion learned with indescribable dismay and indignation the news of the invasion of Grenada by considerable United States military forces. It is obviously an extremely serious violation of the independence and sovereignty of a Member State of the United States.

22. This action is all the more serious because it was undertaken in breach of the fundamental principles of the Charter by a permanent member of the Security Council, one which has openly abused its absolute military superiority to subjugate and conquer a country a thousand times smaller and weaker than the United States. This action is even more dangerous for the peace and security of peoples in Central America, the Caribbean and throughout the world because it was decided upon in cold blood, unknown to important allies of the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and even despite their opposition. The responsibility for this action, full of potential for grave consequences, rests squarely on the shoulders of the present United States Administration, whose reckless tendencies are well known to all.

23. It should also be noted that the invasion to which Grenada has just fallen victim is not an isolated and fortuitous act, but had been very carefully prepared for some time by the United States. It will be recalled that in the course of this year the representative of Grenada had already had occasion to alert members of the Security Council to preparations for a possible invasion of his country. The landing operation in Grenada is clearly an integral part of a scenario, now made reality, carefully prepared long beforehand.

24. No one would think of denying that this act is extremely serious, in the light of the present state of explosive tension throughout the world. But in an attempt to justify it the invaders have used the pretext of protecting American nationals in Grenada and restoring democracy to Grenada. However, the pretext of protecting its nationals smacks too much of the old colonialist gunboat diplomacy of past centuries to need further condemnation today. As for the allegation of defending democracy in Grenada, or even protecting the security of neighbouring countries, it is so patently hypocritical and fallacious that it is not worth spending time on. Is it not more correct to emphasize that—as has been rightly shown by the opinion of peace-loving and justice-loving people throughout the world, including even in the United States—this action is the result of an extremely irresponsible and reckless attitude on the part of the American Administration, which has deliberately flouted the principles of the non-use of force in international relations and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, thus insolently threatening peoples with its international policeman's nightstick, giving a perfect demonstration of the law of the jungle and of depredation in international relations? How hollow and ridiculous their fine words sound therefore in connection with the so-called defence of democracy, human rights and order in the civilized world! Would it not be better repeatedly to pillory their brutal and arrogant conquerors' mentality deliberately trampling on the peoples' independence and freedom and on their aspirations to social justice and to peace and security in the world?

25. There is therefore absolutely no political, legal or moral argument that can justify such massive military intervention against independent and sovereign Grenada.

26. The community of States must speak with one forceful voice in condemning this armed intervention against Grenada. The American Administration has stated that it would not get involved in another Viet Nam. But it appears now that the United States has indeed embarked upon the course of a second Viet Nam. So if a timely stop is not put to the recklessness of the present leaders of the United States, the world will shortly be threatened with a third, fourth and even several Viet Nams. The independence, freedom, peace and stability of small countries and peoples in various parts of the world—in Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East, southern Africa and elsewhere—are from now on very seriously threatened.

27. Viet Nam, which was a victim of one of the longest and bloodiest wars imposed by those very people who have just invaded Grenada, is fully aware of the warlike and brutal nature of the aggressors and empathizes deeply with the people of Grenada, currently undergoing one of the hardest trials of their history, and declares its unfailing

militant solidarity with the heroic struggle of the people of Grenada to defend the independence, sovereignty and territorial independence of their country.

28. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam vigorously condemns the aggression visited upon Grenada and energetically demands the immediate cessation of the armed intervention and the immediate withdrawal of the invading troops from Grenada so that the people of Grenada can enjoy their right to decide on their own future, in complete freedom, without any interference or foreign threat.

29. It is in this spirit that my delegation declares its full support for the draft resolution submitted by Guyana and Nicaragua [*S/16077*] for the Council's consideration.

30. Peace and justice will emerge victorious, as will, we are sure, the just cause of Grenada.

31. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

32. Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria): I shall be very brief. Nigeria is deeply concerned about the military invasion of Grenada by forces from the United States and some eastern Caribbean States. As a non-aligned State and one that is fully committed to the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, we are obliged to state that the invasion is deplorable and wholly unjustified. It represents a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the principle of the non-use of force in relations among States. We in Nigeria have consistently denounced, in this chamber and elsewhere, the frequent resort to force by the big Powers to topple from power Governments which they do not like. We have done so in all cases of foreign military intervention and in all regions of the world. We do so because of our basic commitment to and respect for the Charter and international law, which abjure the use of force against States in order to bring about desired changes in their political and economic systems. Respect for the principle of the Charter and for international law, particularly those laws applicable to relations among States, is indispensable for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is the very foundation of peaceful relations among States.

33. What are the militarily weak States of the world to think of this invasion, which also touches on their own territorial integrity and national security? What are we in Africa to make of this? It should be understandable why we should have some apprehensions about the resort to force against Grenada in circumstances which, we are compelled to say, cannot be justified on either legal or moral grounds.

34. In conclusion, I should like to express the sympathy of the Government and people of Nigeria for the people of Grenada in this, their hour of trial. It is our hope and expectation that there will be a speedy withdrawal of all foreign forces from Grenada, so as to allow the return of normalcy to that island.

35. Mr. NATORF (Poland): The Council is deliberating in a situation of extreme emergency. An assault force from the United States disembarked on the tiny island of Grenada and started hostilities yesterday before dawn. As we are informed, mainly by the news media, armed clashes on the island continue, bringing loss of life and serious sufferings to the population, as well as endangering peace and security in the area.

36. The Grenada adventure involving United States Marines, army troops and sophisticated weaponry, ostensibly was launched to protect and evacuate United States citizens on the island. However, the fallacious arguments raised by the American Administration lack any justification and are totally unacceptable. The representative of Grenada, speaking earlier today before the Council [*2487th meeting*], gave us a clear picture of the real causes of the aggression against his country. He presented us with convincing proof that Grenada posed no threat to its neighbours or to the safety of the United States citizens. The telex that his Government sent to the American authorities proved that the Grenadian Government wanted to continue peaceful relations and co-operation with the United States.

37. No arguments of the kind raised by the United States regarding the situation on the island could justify invasion or aggression. There was no military attack on the United States or the other intervening countries which would justify a defensive military action. On the contrary, there is evidence that it was an operation well planned in advance and that the participation in it of some Caribbean nations was nothing but an effort to create the semblance of a collective action.

38. From the very outset the United States Administration was unwilling to accept the process of progressive change under way in Grenada since 1979 and had threatened the legitimate Government of that sovereign country. As a result, a sovereign nation, a State Member of the United Nations and a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, fell victim to cold-blooded aggression.

39. Two curious documents were circulated among the members of the Security Council, the content of which is aimed at justifying the invasion. The first one contains a statement on the Grenada situation from the OECS Secretariat. It is a rare occasion to read a statement in which violation of basic norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations is presented as restoration of peace and order. Certainly some of the quotations, like "pre-emptive defensive strike", will remain in the infamous dictionary of hypocrisy. In this letter, however, the true intentions, not of its signatories but those of the real force behind the action, were exposed. At the same time one has to admit that the cleverly worded letter of the representative of the United States to the United Nations avoided exposing itself so clearly to the world. But it would be unwise for anybody to think that it is possible to fool everybody all the time. Under any regional agreement there can be no way to justify such action as the one against Grenada.

40. One cannot disregard the wider context of this reckless act of imperialist policy, which was put in doubt even by closest United States allies. This use of force has to be seen as a part of a chain of threats and pressures on Latin American and Caribbean nations in order to make them subservient to the interests of the United States. It is a clear manifestation not only of hostility to the emancipation of peoples but of arrogance, such as that sounded in yesterday's personal tirade against the Nicaraguan representative by the United States representative in her first statement today before dawn. It takes no great political imagination to understand that particularly in the present, already very tense international situation, such a policy poses an extremely serious threat to international peace and security.

41. The United States military action is seen by my Government as an outright act of aggression against Grenada and brutal and open intervention in the internal affairs of an independent State. The armed intervention of the United States is yet another manifestation of the policy of seeking a position of strength, a breach of universally recognized rules of international behaviour and a violation of sovereignty and independence of a small non-aligned Member State of the United Nations. As such, this policy is dangerous to the Organization and to the international community as a whole.

42. Poland resolutely condemns the act of aggression against Grenada and demands the immediate cessation of armed intervention and the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country. The moral censors in Washington, who so willingly were issuing to so many countries of the world, including my own, the certificates of morality or immorality, civilized and non-civilized behaviour, according to their whim, have now brutally tampled the sovereignty of a practically defenceless nation in the most immoral and uncivilized manner.

43. It is necessary that the armed intervention in Grenada be properly condemned, that the necessary steps be taken immediately to withdraw foreign troops from the island, and that the people of Grenada be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination. Although we would like to see the draft resolution on the issue formulated in stronger terms than the draft before us, we believe that its speedy adoption is the least the Council can and should do.

44. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Jamaica. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

45. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica): Jamaica is obliged to request a hearing in this debate because Jamaica is one of the countries which has responded to the appeal of the authority of the OECS to act and to remove a threat which the eastern Caribbean States saw as overhanging their future security, from developments within the régime in Grenada. I am therefore very grateful to the members of the Security Council for having afforded me the opportunity to be heard in this debate.

46. Many delegations have spoken in this debate, but they have commenced from a position in which Grenada, a Member State of the United Nations, is invaded by troops from neighbouring States, and they have therefore attempted to throw the cloak of United Nations respectability around the shoulders of the régime in Grenada. We would ask you to consider, before attempting to accept these premises, on what authority are foreign troops at present in Grenada.

47. Let us begin with the troops of the Cuban Government. Who invited them to Grenada? Are they properly there at the request of a legitimate government of Grenada? You know the answer to that question. It is a resounding "no". The Bishop régime was illegitimate. It had come to power as a result of a *coup*. It had refused to hold elections, in spite of strong pressure from its CARICOM colleagues that the régime should seek to legitimize itself by holding elections, so as to be established by the people of Grenada. They declined to do so. Instead, they concentrated on building up a military force until that force had become strong enough to destroy its political leaders and to place the whole country under siege.

48. We next heard about Grenada's problems when differences amongst the ruling cliques in the country began to emerge. We heard rumours that Maurice Bishop and many of his associates were disposed to return the country to some form of legitimacy and, accordingly, to establish a democratic government in Grenada.

49. What was the result? Mr. Bishop was placed under house arrest. Having been released by his followers, who challenged the authority of the new military régime, he was wounded, re-arrested and executed. Not only was he executed, but four of his ministers, two trade union leaders and other civilians of the country were also executed.

50. But that was not all. A new régime under someone whose name we understand to be Austin had placed the whole Grenadian population under a state of siege. They declared a curfew and made it known that any Grenadian citizen who was found outside of his home after certain hours of the day would be shot on sight. This is a very, very serious state of affairs to be foisted on the people of the country by people claiming to be the Government of that country.

51. Jamaica is a democracy. For over 40 years or more, we have regularly changed our Government through the use of the ballot box—not with soldiers and bullets. We are members of the CARICOM organization as indeed we are members of the Organization of American States (OAS). But we are aware of the fact that the countries which have asked us to take action are not all members of the OAS. They have their own organization, the OECS. They are all democracies. They have forsworn the use of armed forces in their international relations. Countries like Dominica have no army; others have a few policemen to keep law and order. That is all.

52. You have already heard that the OECS has been increasingly concerned about the state of affairs in Gren-

ada, that for years they have witnessed with grave concern the accumulation of troops in Grenada—an accumulation which seemed, in their view, to go far beyond the requirements of internal security. When they found that these troops had taken charge of the country and had disposed of its titular head and his associates, they were entitled to be concerned. Any members of this Organization who found themselves with such absence of security in circumstances such as these would have been concerned. It was a responsibility placed upon their Governments to take action to secure the future of their countries.

53. The OECS has a charter. Under article 8 of that charter, members are required to take action in a collective manner when they recognize that their security is threatened.

54. The authority of the OECS met in Barbados on Friday, 21 October, to evaluate the situation in Grenada arising from the overthrow of the Government of Maurice Bishop. The authority was aware that the overthrow of the Bishop administration took place with the knowledge and connivance of forces unfriendly to the OECS. The authority also took note of the current conditions, the serious violation of human rights and the bloodshed that had occurred, and the consequent unprecedented threat to the peace and security of the region which was created by the vacuum of authority in Grenada.

55. The OECS Chairperson was deeply concerned that military forces and supplies were likely soon to be introduced to consolidate the position of the régime and that the country could be used as a staging post for acts of aggression against surrounding States. The Chairperson, accordingly, wrote to the Right Honourable Edward Seaga, Prime Minister of Jamaica, transmitting the request for assistance under article 8 of the Treaty, to provide transport, logistic support and additional military personnel so as to assist the OECS forces to stabilize this serious situation within the eastern Caribbean.

56. The Jamaican troops are part of a multinational peace-keeping force intended to remove the threat to peace and security in the area and, at the same time, to restore normalcy to the island of Grenada. The Jamaican troops are not there to protect Jamaican citizens; they are not there to determine what form of government the people of Grenada should decide to have. We are there to assist the people of Grenada to free themselves from a military dictatorship and to establish conditions within which it might be possible for the will of the people to be displayed in free and fair elections. The Jamaican troops will leave Grenada as soon as it is clear that such conditions have been established.

57. Grenada, as a Member of the United Nations, is entitled to the protection of the Security Council against the invasion of its territory. It is being suggested that foreign troops should immediately leave Grenada. If one inquires what those who use these expressions have in mind, it is clear that they refer to American troops, Jamaican troops, Barbadian troops and elements from Antigua and other eastern Caribbean States. No one seems to think that the Cuban troops now engaged in the country are foreign troops. By whom were they invited? By whom are they now authorized to resist this so-called invasion?

58. The Jamaican delegation recognizes that the Security Council has ultimate authority in these matters. We accordingly urge the Council not to call for the withdrawal of troops until the safety and territorial integrity of the people of Grenada have been secured.

59. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I invite the representative of Bolivia to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

60. Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation is grateful to you for having given us the opportunity to take part in this meeting which is considered a matter of concern to my country, which respects international law and staunchly supports peace and collective security. At the beginning of my statement I should like to express our satisfaction at seeing you presiding over the Council. We should also like to thank the representative of Guyana and his delegation for the skillful manner in which he presided over the Council's deliberations earlier.

61. It is with dismay that Bolivia became aware of the latest developments in Grenada. In this connection, my Government issued the following statement on 25 October:

> "In the light of the serious events in Grenada, the Republic of Bolivia reiterates its unshakeable adherence to the principles of non-interference and of respect for self-determination, which are the bases of its foreign policy. Therefore, in expressing anxiety over the situation prevailing in Grenada, it demands that a halt be put to the armed intervention in the territory of the sister country and that the occupying troops be withdrawn immediately. In keeping with the norms which govern the regional system, Bolivia demands compliance with the tenets of the charter of the OAS."

62. Bolivia has always condemned all forms of outside interference aimed at undermining the principles of the self-determination of peoples, the territorial integrity and the political and economic independence of States. As far as the countries of Latin America are concerned, the only valid instruments to preserve our sovereignty and settle our disputes are to be found in international law, as expressed in the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the OAS.

63. The position of Bolivia is backed by a national consensus expressed in a resolution passed by the Chamber of Deputies and adopted unanimously on 25 October, which repudiates armed intervention, supports initiatives for a solution in the framework of international organizations to preserve the sovereignty and integrity of the Republic of Grenada, and demands the withdrawal of the troops which have intervened in that country.

64. On behalf of Bolivia I express the sincere wish that the events in Grenada may find a solution as speedily as possible within the framework of international law, which this Council is called upon to preserve, by adopting an appropriate resolution that will ensure the immediate restoration of peace in Grenada.

65. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the statements made by various delegations on the armed invasion of Grenada by the United States.

66. On 25 October United States armed forces numbering nearly 2,000 flagrantly invaded Grenada. By this act the United States has committed undisguised aggression against a small island State with a population of merely 100,000 and has wantonly trampled underfoot the independence and territorial integrity of a sovereign State and intervened in its internal affairs, thereby undermining the peace and stability of the Caribbean region and threatening international peace and security.

67. This is an outright act of hegemonism in gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms governing international relations. The United States is a super-Power, whereas Grenada is a weak and small developing country. The equality of all States, big or small, is a fundamental principle governing modern international relations. All States should coexist peacefully in accordance with the principle of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression and mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Situations in which the strong overpower the weak and the big bully the small must not be tolerated.

68. The United States armed invasion of Grenada on whatever pretext is absolutely inadmissible. If the present invasion of Grenada cannot be checked effectively, incidents of the same nature will happen to other States. What, then, will be the guarantee of the sovereignty and independence of small countries?

69. We are extremely concerned over the situation in Grenada and continue closely to follow its development. The Chinese Government consistently maintains that the affairs of a country should be handled exclusively by the people of that country, free from all outside interference. The Chinese Government strongly condemns the United States invasion of Grenada and demands the immediate and total withdrawal of foreign troops from that country.

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

71. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I thank you and the Council for having responded to our request to participate in the debate on a serious question concerning the international community as a whole and more specifically our own region.

72. The Council has been convened in an emergency meeting to analyse the situation created by the invasion of Grenada by a military force made up of troops of the United States and some Caribbean States. It is clear that this act constitutes a violation of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibit the use of force in international relations and interference in the internal affairs of other States.

73. The invasion of Grenada represents aggression against a Member State of the United Nations. This act, which is grave in itself, is even more dangerous in the context of the existing tension in the region. The policy of confrontation and intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign countries of our continent is reaching alarming proportions, and we should like to express our profound concern at this fact.

74. Argentina deplores the tragic internal events that have recently taken place in Grenada and the invasion of that country, and we support restoration of its full sovereignty as well as withdrawal of the invading forces.

75. I would recall that throughout its history my country has always supported and defended most strongly the principles that preserve the territorial integrity, independence and security of the members of the international community. In stating these views I am merely reiterating the doctrine supported by some of the most outstanding Argentinian statesmen, such as Carlos Calvo, Roque Sáenz Peña, Honorio Pueyrredón and Carlos Saavedra Lamas, who pointed out that the sovereignty of States consists in absolute right, full internal autonomy and complete external independence. International coexistence and the maintenance of international peace and security are based on respect for the different positions of States, without which we should be led into chaos and irreversible confrontation.

76. The principle of non-intervention is explicitly enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. Moreover, it is most firmly supported by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and has been reiterated in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States,[1] in the drafting of which my delegation took an active part. No one must attempt to change by force the situation of a sovereign State by occupying its territory militarily.

77. Guyana and Nicaragua, countries of our region and members of the Council, have presented the draft resolution in document S/16077. My Government, which hopes that the Council will respond appropriately to the events in Grenada, believes that the draft resolution contains the necessary and basic elements for a speedy and satisfactory solution of the present situation in Grenada and therefore firmly supports it.

78. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Seychelles. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

79. Ms. GONTHIER (Seychelles): It gives me pleasure to extend to you, Sir, the sincerest congratulations of my delegation on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council. I should like also to congratulate Mr. Sinclair on discharging the duties of the presidency so well last month.

80. Mr. President, I have the honour of addressing you and the Council today on a situation of grave concern not only to the island Republic of Seychelles but to every Member of the United Nations. The Government of Seychelles condemns the military invasion of Grenada by the United States of America. It further states that this invasion constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and the principle of non-interference in other countries' internal affairs, embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

81. While Seychelles recognizes the unquestionable right of any country to call on partners of its own choice for assistance, it feels that no foreign Power or any country should intervene by force and impose its will on another country if not requested to do so. The Government of Seychelles believes that such military action will further escalate the already worsening situation in the region. This action of the United States can be characterized as that of a "bully", because a precedent has been established whereby similar actions could be used against other small developing islands on the grounds that United States citizens or interests were at stake.

82. Having discussed the legal principles involved in this tragic case, we should like to pay attention to the human aspects involved as well. We wish to pay a tribute to the memory of Maurice, Jacqueline, Unison, Kendrick and other brave Grenadians whose islander vision, honesty and dedication to building a nation free of corruption, a society based on equality of opportunity, good health, decent housing and justice for all, will continue despite mainlander attempts to view and treat decent, young, dynamic and honest leadership with hostility, destabilization and destruction. The once clear blue water that surrounds Grenada has been polluted, and an idealistic young Government intent upon remedying centuries of poverty and exploitation was destroyed last week.

83. In closing, I should like to tell the Council a story that jumped out at me like a hand grenade when I was reading a history book recently. When the first European, Christopher Columbus, discovered Grenada in 1498, it was inhabited by the Carib Indians. None survived colonial times. In the first landing of mainlanders, hundreds of Carib Indians jumped to their deaths from a cliff, now called Caribe's Leap. It is our fear that the present-day islanders may suffer the same fate as the Carib Indians if they cannot get the mainlander to look beyond its own vision. To the Grenadian people, we offer our prayers and sympathy.

84. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Ethiopia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

85. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): Exactly a week ago today the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia extended the felicitations of the Ethiopian delegation to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. Permit me to add my own personal congratulations today and to wish you every success in your difficult task.

86. Once again the Marines have struck, this time in Grenada, to subdue a small, weak and developing country. This time again their declared objectives are the protection of the lives of American citizens and the restoration of democracy, in this case in Grenada. History has not failed to record the many but similar crimes committed in the name of these seemingly lofty goals, while the peoples of the world, too, have never failed to recognize the true objectives of these destructive missions. Today the Marines symbolize the imperial ambitions of the United States of America and provoke bitter memories of shattered hopes and frustrated aspirations of the masses of the third world.

87. The invasion and occupation of Grenada by the United States of America is both illegal and immoral. Neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the charter of the Organization of American States, to which both Grenada and the United States formally subscribe, sanction such an action. Indeed, the provisions of both charters explicitly prohibit the invasion and occupation of an independent and sovereign State. Furthermore, Ethiopia does not believe that the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, whose provision regarding collective self-defence applies only in cases of external aggression, does or can form the legal basis for such adventures. In the conspicuous absence of external aggression, the action taken by the United States in tandem with some parties to that treaty therefore cannot but constitute clear and direct intervention in the internal affairs of Grenada.

88. Ethiopia therefore strongly condemns this wanton aggression and intervention and calls upon the United States to withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces from that sister country of Grenada.

89. The legal obfuscations and the complicity of a few Caribbean States notwithstanding, the invasion of Grenada is but the latest manifestation of the policy of domination and force followed by the present United States Administration. As far as Washington is concerned, the entire developing world is or should be the sphere of influence of the United States and should meekly accept domination by the United States. By this twisted logic, any country that attempts to chart an independent course of national development becomes a target for covert subversion and overt military actions by the United States and/or its regional surrogates.

90. One of the many countries which is now targeted for similar military invasion is Nicaragua. Because of the geographical proximity of Nicaragua to the United States, and the advanced stage of military preparations against that country, we feel it our duty to warn the Council of the imminent and grave danger facing the people and Government of Nicaragua. Though the people of Nicaragua will

valiantly resist any and all acts of aggression, the international community also has a duty to act promptly to avert the serious threat to world peace and security that could result from any violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua.

91. At this grave moment, Ethiopia expresses its support for and solidarity with the people of Grenada. Our thoughts and sympathy go to the many that have fallen while defending the freedom and independence of their motherland. The temporary setback notwithstanding, the people of Grenada will ultimately triumph.

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

93. Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): First, I should like to read a declaration made by a spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria:

> "The serious developments which occurred in the island of Grenada are of deep concern to Algeria. The Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has met in this connection with the United States Ambassador to Algeria. In this context, Algeria recalls that non-interference in the internal affairs of States, as well as strict respect for the right of peoples freely to exercise their choice, are inviolable principles. Their violation is unacceptable, particularly when, in addition, it takes the form of armed intervention.
>
> "Algeria considers that this military operation is particularly serious, since it complicates a regional situation which is already difficult. It increases tension in that area and steps up confrontation to the detriment of dialogue and of the search for a negotiated solution, without which there can be no sound international relations.
>
> "The immediate and unconditional cessation of this intervention is a necessary requirement which the international community should work toward without delay, to permit the people of Grenada to exercise in a sovereign manner their right to choose their own political, economic and social systems and freely to decide on how their problems should be resolved."

94. In their variety and complexity, all matters which come before the Security Council fundamentally imply the need for strict respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the norms of international law.

95. Although subject, like all the others, to the principles and norms which should rule the international behaviour of States lest there be anarchy, the tragic situation which we have at present none the less has certain characteristics which point an accusing finger at what can be called, I think, a moral failure of the authority of law and the reign of justice which the Charter was intended to promote.

96. That moral bankruptcy can be seen, first, through the nature of the protagonists in this tragedy. The fact that a permanent member of the Security Council has indulged in such an armed invasion against a people which is perhaps numerically small but at the same time great because of its devotion to its national dignity, in itself implies a condemnation which brooks no appeal. The fact that, in addition, that invasion has won the political support and the token participation of States in that region represents something which is to be condemned for the present and which represents for the future a very grave danger, including a danger to those States, because such a negation of the sovereignty of States, we believe, necessarily has inherent in it certain suicidal tendencies.

97. This moral bankruptcy can also be seen in the unbelievable inconsistency of the pretexts put forward. A pretext such as the protection of citizens in a particular country such as Grenada is particularly inadmissible in current international law. None can be more aware than the host country of the constituting conference and then of the Headquarters of the United Nations of the strength of the principle of the non-use of force or threat of force against the political independence or territorial integrity of any State. None can be better aware than a permanent member of the Security Council of the very rigorous rules which have to be applied in making exceptions, such as self-defence, to this cardinal principle of the Charter. None can be more aware than the States which have recently come to international sovereignty and whose human and material means are very limited of the vital need to strengthen the effectiveness of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in affairs which fall within the exclusive national purview of each State. A pretext with immeasurable negative consequences, the goal of re-establishing "order" or even "democracy" presents a frontal attack on that principle of non-intervention and non-interference and opens the way to breaches of the peace of varying kinds which are completely uncontrollable. An equally dangerous and intolerable pretext, the so-called threat posed by the domestic situation of Grenada for the entire region, echos the doctrine of preventive war which, the Council has seen, is accompanied by tragic consequences in southern Africa and particularly in the Middle East.

98. At a time when peoples and States in various parts of the world have discovered the promises inherent in the idea of good-neighbourliness, at a time when the tendency towards regional groupings has increased for the purpose of seeking harmony and prosperity together, it is particularly distressing that a constituting treaty of a subregional organization has thus been promoted to the rank of an instrument for unjustifiable attacks against the political independence and territorial integrity of one of its contracting parties.

99. Immediately, as soon as we learned that such a juridical instrument had been invoked, our desire to carry out a complete examination of the situation prompted us to go through the *Treaty Series* published by the United Nations in order to discover the conventional basis underlying this juridical monstrosity which has been presented to us as being in accordance with the aims of the United Nations. It

was impossible to find this document in the *Treaty Series*, and apparently it has in fact not been registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations. The text was finally made available to us through other channels. There is a remarkable error in invoking this unregistered treaty before a body of the United Nations when it is in contravention of the very letter of paragraph 2 of Article 102 of the Charter; it is even more irregular to present to the Security Council a typical violation of the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* as an illustration of the application in good faith of a legal subregional instrument. If we read paragraph 4 of article 8 of that treaty, it indicates quite clearly in effect that the concern which prompted those States parties was simply to provide collective defence against external aggression. Now it is quite obvious that there was no outside aggression and the Government of Grenada did not invoke that treaty, nor did it request any assistance.

100. The continuing flagrant violation of the Charter which we have witnessed has become more serious in view of the political plans of the authors of the invasion with respect to Grenada—plans repeated here today—which amount to nothing less than placing the entire people of that sovereign State Member of the United Nations under trusteeship.

101. In dwelling on some of these fundamental legal considerations, I have not lost sight of the actual chronology of events, or of the disturbing indications that the aggression was coldly premeditated. The news media have issued numerous reports on the movements of the United States naval forces since Thursday, 20 October, prior to the actual meeting of the States members of the OECS.

102. The overt invasion of Grenada by foreign armed forces cannot claim any legality or legitimacy. It is unjustifiable on every count and should therefore be duly condemned by the Security Council as an act of unprovoked armed aggression. With the same firmness, the Council must, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter, require the immediate and unconditional evacuation of the forces of aggression and foreign occupation. Bowing respectfully to the memory of the innocent lives sacrificed as a result of this invasion, and commending the heroic resistance of the people of Grenada, which is clinging to its right to live, I shall have performed an act of moral tribute which Algeria was duty bound to pay to the friendly and sorely tried people of Grenada. I do so as a sincere friend of the other peoples and States of the region and as a member of an international community, whose unassailable values and most elementary principles have been organically affected by this act of armed aggression.

103. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

104. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic is participating in this debate in order to join its voice to the numerous voices which have strongly condemned the invasion of Grenada by the United States of America. That invasion constitutes yet another act of aggression in the chain of American acts of aggression against the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean. We consider that military action by the United States to be a flagrant violation of the inalienable right of the people of Grenada to self-determination and the structuring of its society free from any outside intervention. There is no doubt that this blatant act of aggression stems from an imperialist policy based on supremacy and domination, which are the essential goals of imperialism, whose acts are incompatible with the rules of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

105. The events that took place in Grenada shortly before the American military intervention are the internal affairs of the people of Grenada. Neither the United States nor anyone else has the right to intervene in order to try to shape the destiny of Grenada. There is no justification, either in morality or in law, that can be cited by the United States as a reason for its aggression.

106. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic calls upon the Security Council urgently to condemn that aggression. It also calls for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces from the island, for compensation to be paid for the losses sustained and for a fact-finding mission. The Syrian Arab Republic is ready, in co-operation with non-aligned countries, to mobilize all the necessary political and moral forces in order to protect the sovereignty of a fraternal people whose noble positions within the framework of the United Nations and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries cannot be forgotten.

107. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic calls upon the Security Council to adopt without any modifications the draft resolution sponsored by Guyana and Nicaragua, especially since it is based on the internationally recognized principles to which we have committed ourselves in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and a number of other international instruments, foremost among which are the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,[2] the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States[1] and the resolution, which is so strongly disliked by the United States, on the definition of aggression.[3]

108. If the United Nations—in particular, the Security Council—is to keep whatever is left of its credibility, it must reaffirm, in the context of the invasion of Grenada, the right of that peace-loving and non-aligned island to decide its own destiny, its own political, social and economic system, in order to enable it to conduct its international relations without foreign interference and remaining aloof from sabotage, coercion or intimidation in any form.

109. The Syrian Arab Republic takes this opportunity to declare its deep admiration for the valour of the people of Grenada in the face of the act of aggression perpetrated by

the United States against a small island with a small population, but people have proven that freedom is more valuable than life under the yoke of imperialist supremacy based on the might of arms.

110. Yesterday [*2487th meeting*] we listened attentively to the statement by the representative of Grenada in the Council. We hope that the United States delegation has learnt some lessons from that statement—a statement that expressed very clearly all the feelings that weak peoples experience when they fight treachery, malice and foreign control. He said:

> "Are we to return to the period of the 1950s and 1960s? Are we to allow size and power to determine whether or not a country has the right to pursue its policies as it has chosen? Have we reached such a stage in the world today that no country can be allowed to pursue its policies without the dictates of another country, much bigger, thousands of times the size of our country, trying to tell us what we must do?
>
> "All of us must ask ourselves this, all of us, because the United States is one of the biggest countries in the world, and Grenada is one of the smallest, and many of the countries represented by those present in the chamber tonight, though bigger than Grenada, are much smaller than the United States. If today the United States can invade Grenada and impose a Government to its liking, international law has collapsed and the world will return to anarchy."* [*Ibid., paras. 104 and 105.*]

Those words must be remembered by all because they express the reality of an international community which is no longer governed by the purposes and principles of the Charter but, rather, by the law of the jungle.

111. We are surprised that the United States, which has fomented discord in all parts of the world where it can reach, destroying, killing, bombarding and occupying, and deploying its military naval, air and ground forces in places thousands of miles away from its territory, is doing so on a misleading slogan, namely "establishing democracy". However, by resorting to such pretexts the United States is deceiving no one but the American people, which finds itself thrust into dilemmas and situations that have nothing to do with its vital interests. As a result of the policies pursued by the United States Administration, the individual American is a victim sacrificed on the altar of the betrayal by his Government of other peoples. The American people was forced into aggression against the people of Viet Nam. What was the result? The destruction of Viet Nam, the killing of dozens of thousands of American young men. Today Americans are forced into wars and operations that serve the interests of successive United States Administrations to give candidates a better chance in elections, as though the destiny of the world must be linked to the whims of American candidates and the pressures of various lobbies; as if the American people—as if all of us—had to pay with the blood of our children the price of electoral campaigns for posts in the United States Administration. If we view United States elections as one of the constant factors for determining United States foreign policy, then the world is bound to face local wars every four years.

112. We wonder why the Arabs and the people in Central America are being killed. Why are the crimes perpetrated by Israel, with the support and overt blessing of the United States, to be condoned? Who is to profit from that? There is no real profit. There are losses inflicted upon the international community as a whole. Those who reap profits are the parties to the industrial-military alliance in the United States.

113. The future of this world, of its countries large and small, should not be mortgaged to American interests—to selfish, narrow interests which have nothing to do with those of our struggling people, who aim at nothing but to attain economic and social progress and to consolidate their independence and maintain their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

114. Yesterday we heard the statement made by the representative of Nicaragua, who warned us of the consequences of American military intervention in the States of Central America. We are confident that the United States is planning to carry out its plots and schemes against Nicaragua and other States. Those schemes and acts of intervention are a source of shame for the whole world, in particular because they are being perpetrated under the guise of "democracy," whose quality, degree, goals and value are determined in accordance with the fluctuations of financial markets in a world controlled by monopolistic companies and transnational corporations which have more power and influence than a lot of independent States.

115. The Monroe Doctrine was nothing but a means to legitimize the absolute right claimed by the United States to extend its political, military and economic domination and hegemony over Latin America, with no competition, through aggression and intervention which the United States has tried to prove it can unilaterally carry out, without the support of colonialist European States. In other words the United States refuses multilateralism even in colonialism.

116. The American invasion of Grenada came as no surprise to anyone, for ever since Grenada chose a popular, progressive régime pursuing progressive policies internally and externally, the United States did not cease making it known publicly that it was trying to topple that régime by any means at its disposal. My delegation has always had in mind the American military option, on the basis of our firm belief that imperialism is bound to resort to aggression to change whatever is not compatible with its imperialist objectives in extending its hegemony over any part of the third world. That is particularly so because successive American Administrations have always considered the Caribbean and Central American regions their exclusive spheres of influence, regarding them as regions that were created to serve the interests of American investments and American military strategy.

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

117. There is a major contradiction between the aspirations of peoples to self-determination and the free choice of their own systems, on the one hand, and American interests on the other. Those interests are always satisfied by exploitation carried out through interference in the internal and external affairs of other States—in particular, States geographically located in regions considered by the United States to be its spheres of influence.

118. The invasion by the American navy of the island of Grenada is yet another link in the chain of American interference aimed at creating régimes that acquiesce completely in American selfish interests or at toppling régimes which have chosen the path of self-determination, and have done so in a manner consistent with the wishes of the workers, peasants and intellectuals of those countries.

119. Only yesterday the representative of Nicaragua reminded us of the policies pursued by the United States—its blatant interference in the affairs of the American continent in contemporary history—and we thank him for that, as his statement helps us to analyse the action taken against the island of Grenada in the light of the inevitable identity of imperialist thought and action. The United States has never concealed the fact that its gunboat policy is a natural extension of its world ambitions. Therefore, it justifies that policy and regards it as a commonplace, natural one, stemming from its national interests.

120. For historic reasons, the United States has always believed in the stupid theory that it is infallible, that everything that is done by American democracy is right and that everything that is done by developing countries to achieve progress is wrong. Therefore, the use of force is legitimate, as long as it serves the interests of the American régime. American logic makes United States policy a nightmare for our peoples, which aspire to peace and stability and to progress in all fields. Most of us are developing peoples, trying to build our countries with resources different from those of the American society. Our societies also have different origins. The major problem facing the world today is that the United States is trying to impose its values on the world, and in particular the third world, thus depriving the peoples of that world of the right to build their countries in accordance with their local circumstances, based on their cultural values, geographic and economic situation and national priorities.

121. We pin great hopes on this Council's ability to face the grave situation created by the American invasion. The situation is grave for the whole world, where great distances no longer exist because of the technological revolution, a revolution that augurs well for a better life but at the same time threatens the extinction of life on earth. We hold the United States primarily responsible for the creation of turbulence in this world of ours. We tell the United States that the policy of force pursued by its current Administration in an unprecedented manner will redound on those who carry it out. History is full of examples.

122. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

123. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have asked to speak again because it is necessary to make the following statement.

124. The cowardly, treacherous and base aggression launched yesterday by the imperialist Government of the United States against the heroic people of Grenada seems to have to run its course, or is about to end, to the shame of all honest men everywhere. The right to self-determination and independence of a fraternal Caribbean country, one of the smallest in our hemisphere and certainly on the planet, has been mercilessly trampled underfoot by a State that boasts of possessing the greatest might in the world, by a permanent member of this Council, whose primary obligation is to defend the peace and security of all countries, large or small.

125. This fact, albeit monstrous, is in no way a surprise to us Cubans, who have prior knowledge of the ferocity and cowardly fury of which are capable the heirs of Jim Crow, Theodore Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and of the fascistic, racist and criminal ideology represented by the John Birch Society, the magazine *Commentary* and the intimate circle of collaborators of the present President of the United States, Ronald Reagan.

126. As I pointed out in my statement yesterday [*2487th meeting*], the history of our America—indeed, the history of contemporary mankind—is rife with Yankee "feats" similar to this, which with Wagnerian fanfare the martyrdom of the people of Grenada is touted as a magnificent victory over a mythological Hydra by a bold knight waving the banner of "freedom" and "democracy".

127. There is no cruder evidence of the poverty of the ideology and the political symbolism of the new Yankee Nazis than this disgraceful episode. Paraphrasing the words of the great Spanish poet Antonio Machado, future generations in America will forever recall, with the indignation of the just, that "the crime was in Grenada, in our Grenada".

128. I shall not waste the valuable time of the Council—or my own, for that matter—refuting the base lies of those who will go down in history as wretched butterflies pierced by the just pin of the peoples, as accomplices and lackeys of Yankee imperialism in the martyrdom of the people of Grenada. Eunuchs still with a colonizer mentality, they conceal their national impotence behind their new masters, hoping for the miserable crumbs they beg for in the retinue of treason. However, they will be called to account before Mother America.

129. I do, however, wish to refer to the double-faced, wretched and twisted behaviour of the true architect of the invasion of Grenada, the imperialist Government of the United States.

130. At 2100 hours, Cuban time, on Saturday, 22 October 1983, through the office in charge of United States interests in the Swiss Embassy in Havana, my Government sent the United States Government the following message:

"The American side is aware of the events in Grenada; it is also aware of our position with respect to those events and our intention not to interfere in the internal affairs of that country. We know that you are worried about the many American residents there. Cuba is also worried about the hundreds of advisers working there in various undertakings and by the news that United States naval forces are approaching Grenada.

"According to our information, no American or other foreigner has had any problems, nor have our own people there. It is advisable for us to keep in touch on this question, to co-operate to ensure that any difficulty that may arise and any measure regarding the security of these persons may be resolved favourably, without violence and without interventions in the country."

131. On 25 October, at 8.30 a.m., Cuban time, that is to say, three days after our note was handed over to the head of the United States interests section, Mr. John Ferch, the Government of that country made the following reply to our message:

"The United States interests section in the Swiss Embassy presents its greetings to the Ministry of External Relations of the Republic of Cuba and has the honour to inform the Ministry that the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, impelled by profound concern at the anarchy, the bloodshed and the disregard for life on the island of Grenada, has requested the Government of the United States to help the armed forces of its member States to restore security in Grenada.

"In reply to this request, and taking into account the need to safeguard the lives of hundreds of American citizens who are in Grenada at this time, the Government of the United States has acceded to that request.

"Therefore, armed forces of the States members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, with the support of the United States, Barbados and Jamaica, have entered Grenada for the purpose of restoring order and public safety.

"The Government of the United States is aware that there are military and civilian personnel in Grenada from the Republic of Cuba and has taken into full account the message on this subject handed over on the night of 22 October by the Ministry of External Relations to the chief of the United States interests section in Havana. I wish to assure the Government of the Republic of Cuba that every effort is being made and will continue to be made to guarantee the safety of those persons pending the restoration of order. Those persons will be granted safe conduct from Grenada as soon as conditions permit. The Government of the United States accepts the Cuban proposal of 22 October to respect the safety of persons on both sides.

"Civilian representatives currently in Grenada with the United States armed forces have received instructions to keep in touch with the Cuban ambassador in Grenada in order to guarantee all due consideration and security to Cuban personnel in the island and to provide the necessary means to the Grenadian authorities to facilitate their prompt evacuation. The armed forces of the United States stands ready to guarantee such an evacuation in ships of third parties as soon as possible.

"Furthermore, immediate attention will be given"—I repeat: immediate attention will be given—"to any opinion which Cuba communicates to the State Department through the Cuban interests section in Washington or the office of United States interests in Havana."

132. When this note of the United States Government arrived, one and a half hours earlier—I repeat: one and a half hours earlier—that country's troops had already started attacking Cuban personnel, and three hours earlier disembarkment had begun.

133. At 5 p.m. on 25 October, while intense fighting was going on, the United States Government, through Mr. Ferch, sent the following message:

"The actions of United States troops in Grenada are not aimed at Cuban personnel residing there.

"The United States is ready to co-operate with the Cuban authorities for their personnel to leave for Cuba.

"The United States is aware"—I repeat: "the United States is aware"— "that the armed Cuban personnel have neither the weapons nor the munitions reserves for prolonged action, and, thus, to maintain a belligerent stance would lead to a useless loss of life.

"The United States does not wish to make it appear as if the armed Cuban personnel had surrendered.

"Finally, it regrets that armed clashes have occurred between men of both countries and believes that these have happened because of the confusion and blunders arising out of the presence of Cubans in areas close to the operations of the multinational troops."

134. At 8.30 p.m. yesterday, Cuban time, my country's Ministry of Foreign Relations gave Mr. Ferch the following reply to the note I have just read out:

"Cuba has done everything in its power to avoid intervention, and in our note Saturday we explained that no United States or other foreign citizen, according to our information, is in danger. At the same time, we expressed our readiness to co-operate so that problems could be resolved without violence or intervention.

"Intervention is totally unjustifiable. Cuba has refrained from any interference whatsoever in the internal affairs of the country, in spite of our friendship with and sympathy for Bishop.

"The reply to our constructive note delivered on Saturday, 22 October, at 9 p.m. arrived on Tuesday, 25 October, at 8.30 a.m., when one and a half hours earlier our personnel and installations at the airport were being attacked by United States troops.

"Cuba has no soldiers in Grenada; there are only civilian construction workers and advisers, with the exception of a few dozen military advisers who were working with the army and with the security services before Bishop's death. Our personnel had instructions to fight only if attacked and not to be the first to open fire. Furthermore, they have been instructed not to hinder any action, in the area of the road close to the American university, for the evacuation of American citizens. Clearly, if the aim was to occupy Cuban installations, there would be clashes.

"Our personnel has suffered an unknown number of dead and wounded in today's clashes.

"The attack by United States troops occurred by surprise and without any kind of prior warning.

"Although the Cuban personnel who can still resist are numerically, technically and militarily at a total disadvantage, their morale is high and they are determined to continue defending themselves if these attacks continue.

"If the intention is really to avoid further bloodshed, there must be an end to attacks against the Cuban and Grenadian personnel still in combat and a willingness to find a dignified way of putting an end to the battle, a battle which in no way does honour to the United States acting against small forces which, although they could not resist militarily against the overwhelming superiority of the United States forces, losing the battle and even sacrificing their lives, are in a position to inflict a costly moral defeat on the United States, the most powerful country in the world, which is enmeshed in a war against one of the world's smallest States.

"The Cuban in charge has been given instructions to receive any person in authority who may wish to contact him and listen to his views and transmit them to Cuba."

Finally, the Cuban note concludes by stating that:

"We cannot fail to bear in mind the fact that some Grenadian units are also fighting and that the way in which Cubans are treated must not differ from the treatment accorded to them."

135. The reply to the Cuban message was given early this morning, when United States military aircraft and helicopter gunships, together with artillery and mortar fire, carried out intensive attacks against Cuban positions, destroying almost entirely the main building remaining in Cuban hands and causing many casualties. The survivors—according to information given the people by our Government—continued to fight.

136. At 9 this morning, 26 October, the Cuban ambassador in Grenada related that the note of President Fidel Castro to the United States Government was read out to the Cuban personnel in combat and that our comrades responded that, in keeping with the worthy traditions of our people and following the personal example of our Commander in Chief, they would fight to the last man and the last bullet and that, their morale higher than ever, they would cry out: "Our homeland or death—we shall triumph!" The truth is that after 24 hours of heroic resistance a handful of Cubans continued to wage an historic battle against the naval, air and land forces of the United States.

137. At 9.55 a.m., Cuban time, the Cuban Embassy in Grenada made it known that the most recent enemy attack on our positions had been conducted using all means: fighter aircraft, helicopters, medium- and large-calibre artillery, and mortars. In the end a group of six comrades continued to fight, embracing our flag.

138. At 11.17 a.m., the Cuban ambassador sent this communication: there is no further Cuban resistence. The fighters of the last redoubt did not give in, and sacrificed themselves for their homeland. The contingent of Cuban construction workers and advisers in Grenada, without question, had a patriotic and revolutionary spirit which raises them to the height of those who forged the freedom and dignity of our America.

139. Our revolutionary Government and our Commander in Chief, aware of the special circumstances in which this courageous group of comrades found themselves after the death of Maurice Bishop and his close associates in the Grenadian Party and Government—for all of whom we felt great friendship and respect, as people along with whom we were confronting the same imperialist enemy—did not hesitate to point out the duty which falls to all of us as a result of the profound sense of responsibility and revolutionary solidarity among peoples which we have learned from Fidel personally. Thus, when the Yankee ships were approaching Grenada, the Cuban revolution, out of the most elementary respect for its own lofty values, could not order the withdrawal of our personnel from that sister island. In keeping with our principles they were instructed to defend themselves if attacked, nothing more.

140. The Cuban construction workers and advisers in Grenada and their heroic chief, Colonel Tortoló, calmly and decisively accepted Fidel's instructions. Their tremendous resistence in the face of forces which were vastly superior numerically, technically and militarily demonstrated once again the deep-rooted revolutionary and patriotic convictions of our people and their determination to defend the honour of the homeland and the revolution wherever we may be surprised in battle.

141. Today the forces of imperialism and reaction have martyred Grenada. Tomorrow they could attempt the same in another country of our America or of another continent. This morning United States radio and television broadcast the news that United States armed forces were in a state of alert at the naval base illegally occupied on Cuban territory, at Guantanamo. We alert this Council and world public opinion to that fact, lest the Yankee ruling circles, intoxicated by their tremendous victory over tiny Grenada, should decide to perpetrate an act of provocation against Cuba, as they attempted to do in the 1960s. If attacked, the Cuban people, our glorious revolutionary armed forces and our territorial militias will be able to defend the soil of our homeland with the same courage, tenacity and heroism displayed by our comrades who fell in combat in Grenada.

142. Grenada could turn out to be for the Yankee imperialists in Latin America and the Caribbean what Moncada was for the Batista tyranny in Cuba. Eternal glory to the heroes of Grenada! Our homeland or death—we shall triumph!

143. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): France maintains relations of esteem and friendship with Grenada. Linked to the European Community by the Lomé Convention, Grenada had gradually developed co-operative relations with my country in the economic and cultural spheres. The visit by Mr. Maurice Bishop to Paris in September 1982 bore witness at the highest possible level to the desire of both our Governments further to strengthen those ties.

144. This explains the attention with which France followed the events that led on 19 October to the tragic death of Mr. Bishop and of several of his associates. My Government immediately expressed its sadness and concern at the disturbances once again affecting Grenada. That concern increased at the news of the foreign armed intervention in the island.

145. France is devoted to respect for the principles of non-use of force in international relations and of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and deeply deplores this armed intervention. As recalled by the President of the French Republic, Mr. François Mitterand, "Law is indivisible. International society is based on principles—in particular on the right of peoples to self-determination—which hold the same value everywhere."

146. The justifications put forward, relating to the internal situation of Grenada, do not seem to us to be admissible. They do not meet the conditions under which an intervention of this nature and magnitude could be considered. International law, in particular the Charter of the United Nations, authorizes intervention only in two eventualities: in response to a request from the legitimate authorities of the country, or upon a decision taken by the Security Council. I must add that France has never accepted certain interpretations of the Charter whereby other organs could authorize armed intervention without the approval of the Security Council.

147. In the present situation, we are thinking of the people of Grenada and their future. Everything must be done to allow them, without any further delay, to regain the right to decide their fate, independently and in full sovereignty.

148. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Antigua and Barbuda. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

149. Mr. JACOBS (Antigua and Barbuda): I wish, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the important office of President of the Security Council for the month of October. Your diplomatic skills, outstanding abilities and the lofty ideals and principles which you hold, will, I am sure, guide the deliberations of this body.

150. Before I begin my statement, I wish to draw attention to a statement made by the representative of Cuba yesterday before the General Assembly.[4] He accused the OECS countries of being lackeys for the imperialist United States of America.

151. In my right of defence in this forum, I wish to state that my country, Antigua and Barbuda, is a small island, a member of that group of States that is militarily weak and economically vulnerable. In this world, which has become progressively more susceptible to the menace of power, small countries such as mine are discovering with increasing frequency that the principles of justice and equality of universal peace and development for which this body was created are discarded daily.

152. My delegation deeply resents the arrogance which leads some countries to believe that they have a God-given right to make decisions for the rest of us, especially when we are small and militarily weak. My delegation resents the term "lackeys" used by the representative of Cuba to described the OECS countries, which agreed amongst themselves to take concerted action to free their brothers in Grenada from the tyranny of guns.

153. When these belligerent countries speak about lackeys, I must state unequivocally that the communist satellites, the lackeys and puppets of totalitarianism, must remember that their sole purpose is to impose the will of their imperialist masters on others. When we speak of lackeys and puppets, we speak of those who dared not and could not condemn the Soviet Union for the invasion of Afghanistan and the subsequent mass annihilation of Afghan nationals. When we speak of puppets, we speak of those who dared not and never could condemn the Soviet butchers for blasting the Korean air liner from the skies. We speak of those who oppress and suppress their people at the will of their masters. We speak of those who ban a free press and turn their backs on constitutional government supported by the will of the electorate.

154. In this regard, my country, though small, is free. We make our own decisions. We speak boldly when we must. We condemn those who are wrong. We support the cause

of justice and we uphold the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

155. In 1979 there was a bloodless coup in Grenada, a member State of the OECS. Following the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, the OECS member States worked harmoniously with their brothers and sisters in Grenada.

156. A few days ago, Mr. Maurice Bishop, leader of the People's Revolutionary Movement in Grenada, was placed under house arrest because he sought to reintroduce constitutional rule with a parliamentary system and restore to the people the right to elect their own government. Backed by Cuban and communist troops, a few madmen seized power and foisted on the backs of our black brothers and sisters a revolutionary junta with Cubans and Russians as advisers. When the people gathered in large numbers and removed Mr. Bishop from house detention, the crowd was dispersed with shells and bullets. Mr. Bishop and four of his cabinet ministers were lined up against a wall and shot to death. The rule of law was replaced by the rule of the gun.

157. This state of affairs constituted a serious threat to the security and peace of the region. The OECS and its CARICOM partners met in urgent session and agreed to assist their black brothers and sisters in Grenada. The Caribbean countries invited the United States, whose citizens were threatened, to assist in the operation.

158. The OECS will ensure that an interim government is established in Grenada to carry out the people's mandate for free elections. When this is done and the constitutional rights of our brothers have been restored, our assistance will no longer be required and our help will be withdrawn.

159. The OECS countries will band together with anyone who respects the human rights and constitutional privileges of the people to keep peace and prosperity in the region. We seek no quarrel. We seek no guns. We seek only the economic well-being and the democratic rights of our people.

160. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

161. Mr. RAJAEE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I did not take the floor to compare the size of the land or population or the military power of the invading country, namely the United States, with that of the victim country, namely Grenada. I have no intention of going into the disgusting legalistic excuse which the invading forces have formulated for themselves to justify their aggression. I should like to pose a very simple question. Why? Just why did they do it? What allegedly dangerous consequence did they prevent by invading a country like Grenada, so small in population, but so great in value? My delegation wishes to express its profound regret at the mockery that a permanent member of the Security Council blatantly makes of the Council.

162. I wish to share the views of those previous speakers who asked the Council to condemn this act of the Administration of the United States. We regret that, in spite of all this mockery, the same members of the Security Council hypocritically pretend to take the Council seriously by occupying their seats. We regret that they enter every house without the permission of the household. The signature of the international body at the bottom of the documents recognizing the membership of Saint Christopher and Nevis has not yet dried. On the one hand, we are bringing in new members—new innocent people—to this United Nations; and on the other hand, we are committing an act of aggression against a small country like Grenada.

163. What can we call this unpredictable act? Why this discrepancy? On the one hand, we present the United Nations as a place of refuge and, on the other hand, from the seat of the Security Council of the same United Nations we invade the country of another member. Why?

164. The act of aggression perpetrated against Grenada by the United States Administration is indeed an example of many similar acts which demonstrate the ugly nature of imperialism. My delegation has no doubt that the American people, like the future history of the United States, is and will always be ashamed of the blatant and reproachable act of aggression committed against Grenada by the present United States Administration. However, this aggression should be a lesson to those countries whose Administrations have chosen to remain puppets of the United States to wake up and reconsider their attitude and finally to realize that it is not so wise of them to remain servile dependents of the United States.

165. My delegation strongly urges the Council to condemn the act of aggression committed by the United States against Grenada and to spare no effort to make the United States withdraw its troops immediately from Grenada. The United States Administration must appologize to the people of Grenada and must be held accountable for the unnecessary bloodshed and destruction that it has perpetrated, and still is savagely perpetrating, against those good, innocent people.

166. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

167. Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Sir, my delegation, while thanking you for having allowed us to speak before the Council, would like to express its pleasure at your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We would also like to congratulate your predecessor, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana, for the able and competent way he discharged his duties as President in September.

168. The event we have been witnessing since yesterday morning—that is, the invasion of Grenada, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and a Member of this Organization, by a big Power which is a permanent member of the Security Council—could be fraught with consequences for other small States. The presumptuous way in which the leaders of this action tried to justify their unseemly action cannot fail to disgust any person of common sense and to alarm peace-loving and justice-loving peoples who cherish social progress.

169. In order to justify its inadmissible intervention, the United States Government has unhesitatingly adduced reasons totally inconsistent with each other when confronted with the actual situation: safety of United States citizens, a threat to the maintenance of peace and security in the eastern Caribbean, defence of democracy and so forth.

170. Protection of United States citizens? Against whom and against what? At no time were their lives in danger. The Chancellor of the St. George's School of Medicine himself said that the Government of Grenada had assured him of the security of his students. Last night, speaking in this Chamber [*2487th meeting*], the representative of Grenada confirmed that.

171. To guarantee the maintenance of peace and security in the eastern Caribbean? Of course, we deplore the death of Mr. Maurice Bishop and some of his ministers. But how can the domestic affairs of Grenada be a threat to its neighbours? Did the assassination of President Kennedy or the attempted assassination of President Reagan when he came to power threaten the security of the neighbours of the United States and the security of the region? Who gave the United States the right to set itself up as an international policeman?

172. To assist the Grenadian people to defend democracy? If the American people prefers its form of democracy, that is its business and there is no reason for its Government to seek to impose it on other peoples, particularly not at gunpoint. Similarly, if the Grenadian people has decided to choose a social system that seems appropriate to it, that is its business; even a coalminer is master in his own house. This emanates from the right of peoples to self-determination. Furthermore, with all its difficulties, the Grenadian people has at no time asked the United States to come to its assistance.

173. But the height of ridiculousness is that the Government of the United States is claiming that it undertook this "glorious" action to defend the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the Organization of American States. We are all familiar with the tenets of the Charter, in particular Article 2, paragraph 4, which states:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations".

With regard to the charter of the Organization of American States, the Members of that organization that have spoken in the Council since yesterday have all said there is no provision authorizing such an intervention. By virtue of what charter does the United States Government want to assure its defence? No doubt the charter of imperialism and the charter of the Pentagon.

174. It is clear that this gunboat diplomacy endangers the stability of the non-aligned countries, in particular the small ones, merely because their Governments' policies are not to the liking of the Washington authorities. That is why the Lao Government and people, while reaffirming their unswerving solidarity with the Grenadian people, which is now heroically resisting barbaric aggression, vehemently condemn this invasion, which has caused the death of so many innocent people, and we call upon the Security Council to take appropriate steps to secure the immediate withdrawal of the troops of aggression from that country.

175. Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): Pakistan is deeply concerned at the tragic turn of events in the eastern Caribbean region, where Grenada, a member of the OECS, was overwhelmed yesterday by a combined force contributed by a number of countries of the region and the United States. Attempts have been made to justify the strike against Grenada as a pre-emptive defensive action by neighbouring States on the basis of the threat perceived by them in Grenada's acquisition of disproportionate military capability with foreign help. These States also claim that they were appalled at the intolerable State of affairs inside Grenada.

176. We cannot accept any of these reasons as valid for the external intervention that has taken place in Grenada. Pakistan has always upheld the principle of non-use of force and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States—a principle which flows from the Charter of the United Nations. Accordingly Pakistan has consistently condemned violations of these principles, no matter by whom and no matter where they have occurred.

177. Powerful States seizing opportunities for interference in the internal affairs of small neighbouring countries in pursuit of their own national interests and regional and global strategic objectives is not an uncommon experience in our contemporary world. Such actions aggravate the very situations which external intervention seeks to redress, not to speak of the immense tragedy which is inflicted on the countries which are the objects of such intervention.

178. Four years ago, when the Soviet Union took a similar action in neighbouring Afghanistan, Pakistan firmly opposed that action and reminded the international community of its damaging consequences for regional stability and world peace and security. We regarded it as a dangerous precedent and a threat to all nations, particularly those which lived in the shadow of great Powers. Consistent with our position, which is rooted in our fundamental perceptions of international relations and our concern for peace and stability, we cannot condone the military intervention in Grenada, and we join in the demand for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces from that country.

179. The events in Grenada once again serve as a reminder that peace and security in our world are indivisible and that the principles of non-use of force and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States cannot be espoused or affirmed on a selective basis.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

NOTES

[1] General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex.
[2] General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV).
[3] General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex.
[4] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, Volume II*, 35th meeting, paras. 4-9.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-60205—May 1992—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2490th MEETING: 27 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2490)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);	
(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2490th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 27 October 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2490)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);
   (*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

The meeting was called to order at 11.55 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);
(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the representative of Senegal to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamara (Senegal) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the President of the Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Wasiuddin (Vice-President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite Mr. Mueshihange to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mueshihange took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2481st to 2486th and 2488th meetings, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Peru, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Kulawiec (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Somogyi (Hungary), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. Arias Stella (Peru), Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Vene-

zuela), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Turkey and Uganda in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kirca (Turkey) and Mr. Otunnu (Uganda) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): Member of the Council have before them document S/16085, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Togo, Zaire and Zimbabwe. I should also like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/16081, which contains the text of a letter dated 25 October from the representatives of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States addressed to the President of the Council.

7. The first speaker is the representative of the Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

8. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express to you and to the members of the Council my delegation's thanks and appreciation for being allowed to participate in the deliberations of the Council on the item on its agenda, the situation in Namibia. We should also like to express to you our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. Your wisdom and competence in the diplomatic sphere, as well as the commitment of your country, Jordan, to the cause of colonial peoples whose fundamental human rights are being flouted and whose right to self-determination is being denied will assist the Council in achieving the fruitful and constructive results we all desire.

9. We should also like to express our appreciation to Mr. Noel Sinclair, the representative of Guyana, for his meritorious efforts in the service of the Council during his presidency last month.

10. The Council is meeting for the second time in five months, to consider the question of Namibia. At the end of last May, acting on the recommendation of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the Council met to consider developments in Namibia with a view to placing them in their true perspective in the light of recent statements by South Africa linking Namibian independence to an extraneous issue that was not germane to the question of independence for that Territory.

11. As is well known, the meetings of the Council resulted in the adoption of resolution 532 (1983), in which the Council decided to mandate the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties concerned with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General carried out his mission brilliantly and submitted the report contained in document S/15943. I take this opportunity to express to the Secretary-General our appreciation for his painstaking efforts and, in particular, for the way in which he conducted the consultations in southern Africa and for his insistence on confining the consultations to the remaining outstanding issues connected with the principle of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and within the framework of resolution 532 (1983).

12. For Africa and the international community as a whole, it was a good augury that the five Western States of what is known as the contact group decided to play a major role in the intense and delicate negotiations that finally led to the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, approved in resolution 435 (1978). At that time my country had the honour of serving as President of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and we stated on its behalf that the United Nations plan as a whole did not deal with all of Africa's aspirations to ensure the achievement of the independence of the people of Namibia, but that we accepted it as the minimum African position, in the hope that it might lead in a few months to proclaiming Namibia an independent and free country joining the family of other free and independent nations. [*2088th meeting, paras. 87-96.*]

13. At that time, the Sudan made a number of observations and proposals designed to close certain gaps in resolution 435 (1978) and to eliminate the ambiguity in its content. The subsequent negotiations concerning the implementation of the resolution proved the validity of the African feeling, characterized at first by vigilance and caution and then by co-operation and flexibility.

14. Between 1978 and 1981, certain questions created by South Africa surfaced one after the other. The first was a demand by South Africa for an increase in the number of inspection posts in the demilitarized zone and for the stationing of some elements of its forces at those posts. At that time we were told that these were legitimate demands, giving South Africa the guarantee that the forces of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) would not infiltrate through neighbouring countries. We all remember the difficult decision that the front-line States had to take and its implications for their territorial integrity and sovereignty. Then there emerged the question of the impartiality of the United Nations. That was followed by a request by South Africa for the participation of what it called the internal parties in the current negotiations.

15. Thanks to the constructive flexibility and spirit of co-operation of the leadership of SWAPO and the front-

line States and Nigeria, Africa emerged from each round of negotiations more capable of, and more cautious about, facing the prevarication and strategems of the Pretoria authorities in their attempts to undermine resolution 435 (1978).

16. During 1982 the *apartheid* authorities started to speak publicly of what had only been whispered before—that is, the so-called linkage between the withdrawal of the Cuban troops in Angola and the implementation of the United Nations plan. Recently we heard the representative of the racist régime state in the Council that there is support for its position within the international community [*see 2481st meeting, para. 149*]. This in itself not only constitutes defiance of the will of the international community but also represents disdain for the position and weight of the Organization. Representatives of the Non-Aligned Movement, of the OAU, of the League of Arab States and of the Socialist countries who have spoken in the Council have rejected the linkage issue, as a whole and in all its parts, and have stated that, in addition to being extraneous to the contents of resolution 435 (1978), the linkage issue is not negotiable and cannot be considered within the framework of the authority of the Council.

17. In this respect, I wish to refer to the following statement by the Foreign Minister of the Sudan in the General Assembly on 11 October this year:

> "following [the] completion [of the Secretary-General's mission] we deem it necessary that the Security Council commence the implementation of the peace plan according to an agreed timetable which would be binding on South Africa and which would not involve extraneous issues such as linkage of the independence of Namibia with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Independence is one of Namibia's basic legitimate rights and it should not be subject to conditions or compromises. It is a right that calls for urgent international action to exert pressure on the Government of South Africa to enable the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination."[1]

18. My delegation is pleased that the Secretary-General has restored the negotiations to their normal course and that agreement has been reached in regard to some pending issues concerning the setting-up of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and its mandate, as well as the electoral system. We welcome what has been achieved in regard to UNTAG and are gratified at the statement in the Secretary-General's report that, as far as UNTAG is concerned, the prolonged and intensive consultations resulted in resolving virtually all the outstanding difficulties. As for the electoral system, Sudan supports the position of SWAPO and the African front-line States in regard to the necessity of reaching agreement on the electoral system before starting the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), bearing in mind that there has already been agreement that the system would be based on single-member constituencies or proportional representation.

19. Africa participated effectively and actively in all the negotiations initiated by the Western contact group. It gave serious and sincere consideration to everything put forward by the contact group in its quest for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), hoping that that quest would lead to the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia to exercise self-determination and obtain independence. We have in more than one forum expressed our appreciation of the efforts of the five Western States in this respect. We feel that its mission has been completed and that it is now for the Council to shoulder actively its full responsibilities with efficiency and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. In this respect, my delegation calls on the Council to take the following measures: first, to formulate a specific timetable for the implementation of the peaceful settlement agreed upon; secondly, to reject any linkage between the independence of Namibia and any elements extraneous to resolution 435 (1978); thirdly, to call on South Africa to inform the Secretary-General by a certain date of its position on the electoral system; fourthly, to ask South Africa to undertake immediately, in accordance with that timetable, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); and fifthly, if South Africa continues to defy the authority of the Council, to meet forthwith in order to apply the mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

20. The Sudan and its people and Government are following the developments in Namibia with grave concern. The Sudan will continue providing support and assistance to the struggling people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, until victory. The Sudan will keep its promise to participate in efforts to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978), in accordance with what President Gaafar Nimeiri said in 1978 concerning the Sudan's commitment to be part of UNTAG.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Peru. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to congratulate you most sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. My delegation is particularly pleased that the representative of a friendly country and an active member of the Non-Aligned Movement of your ability, skill and good judgement is guiding these debates.

23. Once again the members of the international community are appearing before the Council to condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and to seek a solution to the tragedy of a people whose hope of achieving the exercise of their inalienable right to independence has repeatedly been frustrated.

24. In this context, I wish to state my delegation's deep appreciation of the efforts of the Secretary-General in compliance with the mandate given him in Council resolution 532 (1983) and of the special interest he has shown in the question of Namibia from the moment he assumed his responsibilities. His report could not be more eloquent nor his conclusions of greater concern. Namibia's indepen-

dence is an indispensable pre-condition to guaranteeing peace in southern Africa. Opposition to this and persistence in illegal occupation exacerbates the conditions for the outbreak of a conflict of incalculable dimensions that would increasingly endanger international peace.

25. As has been rightly stated by the representative of Nigeria,

> "The story of Namibia is a tragedy not only for the people of Namibia but also for people of conscience throughout the world. It is the tragic story of a peaceful but proud people who have been subdued by force and subjected to institutionalized racism." [*2483rd meeting, para. 17.*]

This bleak history and the justice of the Namibian cause have reinforced as never before the generally-held conviction that independence for its people must not be further delayed.

26. Many and difficult are the pitfalls which have been overcome so far thanks to international support and solidarity. We are now faced with yet another difficulty, to the solution of which we must apply our best efforts. A few days ago the representative of South Africa put forward the argument in this chamber that the so-called linkage "is acknowledged and has support within the international community" [*2481st meeting, para. 149*]. However, the wide-ranging and varied support the Council has given to the unconditional independence of Namibia allows no grounds for such an assertion.

27. In this connection, we draw attention to the attitude of one of the members of the contact group, which has dissociated itself from this demand—an attitude shared by other members of the Group of Western States. These statements lead us to hope that this sensible and realistic position may win new adherents in the interest of the freedom of the Namibian people and international peace and security, which affect all the Members of the United Nations without exception.

28. For those reasons, immediate implementation of the Council resolutions on Namibian independence is essential. We consider the solution of outstanding problems concerning UNTAG, achieved during the visit of the Secretary-General to South Africa, to be a positive step. Similarly, we are pleased to know of the readiness of SWAPO to sign a cease-fire agreement and to continue to co-operate with the Secretary-General to facilitate the rapid implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

29. The international community in general and my country in particular hope that Namibian independence will be achieved as soon as possible, with full respect for its territorial integrity and the will of its people and within the sole existing legal framework: that is, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice[2] and the relevant resolutions of the Council. We trust that, at the conclusion of its deliberations, the Council will be able to adopt the measures most appropriate for ensuring that the tragedy of the Namibian people is brought to an end.

30. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

31. Mr. SOMOGYI (Hungary): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October and to express my confidence that your known diplomatic skill and wisdom will contribute greatly to the success of the work of the Council. At the same time, I should like to place on record our appreciation of the exemplary manner in which Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana conducted the work of this august body last month.

32. It is a great honour and privilege for me to express to you, Mr. President, and, through you, to the other members of the Council, my delegation's thanks for the opportunity accorded to us to participate in the discussion of this very important item.

33. The question of Namibia has been discussed in the Council many times. Five years ago, in the course of those deliberations, a plan for Namibia's independence was elaborated and accepted. Resolution 435 (1978), which was the result of extensive, wide-scale consultations among the interested parties, envisaged ways and means to achieve Namibia's independence. It contains concrete steps, starting with a cease-fire and ending with elections to be held under United Nations supervision.

34. Unfortunately, however, the provisions of that resolution, which have been confirmed and reconfirmed time and again, have not yet been implemented. Namibia, despite all the United Nations resolutions and the ever-growing demand of world public opinion, is still prevented from attaining independence. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is still going on; foreign economic and political interests are still prevailing; the natural and human resources of that Territory are still plundered and abused; the people of Namibia are still deprived of all the fundamental human rights, of self-determination and of independence.

35. It is clear to us all that this situation is in sharp contradiction with all norms of international law, as well as the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. South Africa's Mandate over that Territory was terminated as early as 1966 by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), and, since then, the Assembly and the Council alike have adopted numerous resolutions to the same effect. Nevertheless, the situation has not improved, rather it has further deteriorated in the past years. Ever-newer obstacles have been introduced by the racist régime and its Western supporters in order to hamper the just and lasting solution of the problem of the much-suffering Namibian people.

36. My delegation has studied carefully the report of the Secretary-General [*S/15943*] in which he gave a correct account of his consultations with the representatives of South Africa. In his report, the Secretary-General concluded that the consultations with the representatives of

the Government of South Africa resulted in resolving virtually all of the outstanding issues, as far as UNTAG was concerned. However, it was also indicated in that report that "the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan." [*Ibid., para. 25.*]

37. The representative of South Africa has once again reiterated his Government's position to the Council [*2481st meeting*] and confirmed it as being irrevocable.

38. Only a very few support the position of South Africa on this linkage, on the false pretext that the security interests of all the parties have to be addressed. But it should be emphasized again, in no uncertain terms, that resorting to prevarication and introducing extraneous factors only harm the cause and delay the genuine settlement of this long-standing issue.

39. The purpose of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is so clear to everybody that it needs no elaboration. They have been invited by the legitimate Government of Angola to defend its territory against armed aggression by South Africa. Their stay or withdrawal is a matter of bilateral agreement between the two Governments.

40. At the same time it must be obvious to everyone that no legitimate explanation can be given for the South African presence in Namibia, for the barbarous attacks the troops of the Pretoria régime repeatedly launch against Angola and the other front-line States, or for the aggressive political course pursued by Pretoria, one that constitutes unprovoked, premeditated intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign African States and endangers the peace and security of that region.

41. As for the security of South Africa, it is threatened not by its neighbours but by its own *apartheid* system, by its own policy of colonialism and aggression.

42. South Africa could not have defied the resolutions of the United Nations and could not have hindered their implementation without the support of its allies, primarily the United States. Therefore, we urge the members of the Western contact group of five—first of all, those which are members of the Council—to reconsider their position and exert pressure on South Africa to ensure its compliance with the resolutions of the United Nations.

43. My delegation believes that the Council has to act quickly and resolutely this time, bearing in mind the dangers in the southern part of Africa stemming from the intransigence of the racist régime. First of all, the Council has unconditionally to reject the linkage between the independence of Namibia and the presence of internationalist Cuban troops in Angola. Secondly, a specific timetable should be decided upon to implement without further delay resolution 435 (1978). If South Africa fails to abide by Council resolutions, the Council should consider mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

44. My delegation believes that the respect and the authority of the United Nations is at stake if the racist régime of South Africa is allowed to get away with its intransigence. It is imperative for all of us to preserve the respect for this body in order to maintain international peace and security.

45. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

46. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, may I thank you for the opportunity given to me to speak in the Council and to take part in the work of the present important meetings. May I likewise congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council and to wish you success in carrying out this important and complicated mission. We are convinced that your great professional qualities, as well as your experience spanning many years, are a pledge that under your direction our work will be effective.

47. We should also like to pay tribute to the work of the representative of Guyana, Mr. Noel Sinclair, who performed the duties of President of the Council in September of this year.

48. It is the second time this year, and after many other occasions since the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978), that this body is required to consider the question of Namibia. During the last five years—in other words, since the adoption of the United Nations plan to ensure the independence of the Namibian people—the question of Namibia has frequently been discussed in this body and, each time, an urgent appeal for the implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of the imperative rules of international law has been sounded, as well as an appeal for the decolonization of Namibia and the adoption of appropriate measures so that the Namibian people might at last be granted an opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination.

49. However, we are forced once again to observe that these appeals have led to no results whatsoever. The Government of Pretoria ignores both the legally binding decisions of the United Nations concerning termination of the Mandate of South Africa in Namibia as well as the decisions adopted subsequently by the General Assembly and the Security Council. It refuses to end its unlawful occupation of the Territory, and is continually building up its troops there; they now number more than 100,000 men. It is organising the forcible recruitment of young Namibians whom it uses for the purpose of repression and murder of their own brothers. It is inflicting cruel, large-scale repression upon the civilian population of the country, even using mercenaries for this purpose. It is killing those who fight for freedom and independence in Namibia arbitrarily imprisoning a number of political leaders and supporters of SWAPO. It is torturing imprisoned patriots. It is mercilessly exploiting the human, natural and material resources of Namibia. It is constantly making attempts to cobble together a coalition of collaborators and traitors,

and is trying to perpetuate its domination in Namibia by means of the forcible introduction of colonial, political and constitutional schemes. It is continuing to make efforts to splinter the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

50. The territory of Namibia is also used by the Pretoria régime as a staging area for armed aggression against neighbouring independent African States. We must here mention primarily the attacks on Angola and the occupation of part of the territory of that country; the attacks upon Mozambique, the most recent of which took place a week ago; and the forays and subversive action against Zambia, Lesotho and Zimbabwe. South Africa is striving to bring about the downfall of the progressive, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist Governments of the front-line States. Armed aggression is the instrument for the implementation of its regional policy, aimed at taking over the whole of southern Africa. As a result of Pretoria's policy, the region has been converted into one of the most serious flash-points of crisis in the world today. It is not only the source of regional tensions but a threat to peace and security in general.

51. However, we are not speaking only of the policy of South Africa. We are speaking also about the position of certain Western States. They are the ones blocking the implementation of the United Nations plan; the racist policy of occupation and aggression adopted by South Africa is possible only because of the comprehensive support of the United States, certain other Western Powers and Israel. Were it not for the diplomatic, political, strategic, military and economic co-operation of those States, the Pretoria régime would be unable to ignore United Nations decisions, the will of the international community and world public opinion. The support of the West provides favourable conditions for all the manifestations of the internal and external policies of the *apartheid* régime, manifestations which are worthy of condemnation and which are condemned, including the flouting of the elementary rights of the Namibian people. Pretoria is met halfway by those States which, in the course of the discussion of economic sanctions in the Security Council, repeatedly use their right of veto, as well as by the International Monetary Fund, which has magnanimously offered it a loan of over $US 1 billion.

52. Pretoria is acquiring, either as direct supplies or through the granting of licences, the weapons and military *matériel* needed to sow terror inside the country and to carry out its policy of occupation and aggression directed against other States. The aid provided by the West and by Israel has contributed, and continues to contribute, to the marked progress in Pretoria's nuclear potential, which is arrousing fears not only in the neighbouring States but among peace-loving mankind as a whole. The economic monopolies of the Western countries are making a large contribution to supporting the functioning of the *apartheid* machine, and together with South African companies are participating intensively in the plunder of the potential of the future Namibian economy.

53. Thus it is no accident that the work of decolonization, the exercise of basic human rights and the establishment of peace and security in southern Africa are opposed by the very forces that are now striving to destabilize the situation in Europe and throughout the world. These are the forces that are whipping up the arms race, increasing the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war and acting against the vital interests of the peoples of all continents.

54. The present Administration of the United States has been instrumental in putting forward the completely unjustified and totally unacceptable demand to link the granting of independence to Namibia with the withdrawal of the internationalist Cuban units from Angola. The units went to Angola at the request of the Angolan people and Government under an inter-State agreement in order to help protect the country against the armed invasion of South African troops and against the onslaughts of Pretoria, organized and financed by traitors and mercenaries. Washington is striving to direct its efforts to achieve an early solution of the Namibian question against the revolutionary Government of Angola and trying to reverse the progressive, anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist developments in Angola. In Pretoria it has found a diligent proxy which is seeking any excuse to continue and perpetuate its colonial domination of Namibia. This is a kind of obstruction which has not the slightest foundation in international law and is devoid of any logical ties. This is flagrant interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign States.

55. Czechoslovakia condemns the continuing occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the troops of the *apartheid* régime, the denial to the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination and the acts of aggression against independent African States. We categorically reject any attempts to link the legitimate demand concerning the granting of independence to Namibia with any questions that bear no relation to this problem. We also reject any other obstructions by South Africa and its Western allies. We stand in total solidarity with the liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, and support their struggle. We have stated this on a number of occasions, both from the rostrum of the United Nations and on other occasions. For instance, in connection with the mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia to Czechoslovakia in April this year,[3] as well as at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.[4] This position of ours has been confirmed also by the highest figure in Czechoslovakia, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovakia Communist Party, the President of Czechoslovakia, Gustav Husak, in the course of a reception for the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, 14 days ago in Prague. It is our conviction that the adoption of effective measures against any further blocking of the granting of independence to Namibia cannot be further postponed. Like the majority of speakers before us, we too are of the opinion that it is only through the introduction of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter that it will be possible to compel the Pretoria régime, in fulfilment of the United Nations plan, to grant

independence to Namibia. At the present meetings of the Council, decisions should be adopted to ensure achievement of the intended goal, namely, the definitive decolonization of Namibia and the exercise of the right to self-determination by its people, who are enduring unbelievably excruciating suffering.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): Sir, I wish to thank the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to make this statement. I should also like to express our satisfaction at seeing you, the representative of a country with which Turkey enjoys brotherly relations, presiding over the Council this month. My delegation is confident that you will guide the work of the Council in the best possible way. I also wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana on his presidency last month.

58. The Council is now engaged in the pressing task of reviewing recent developments concerning the question of Namibia, with the aim of bringing about the independence of Namibia without further delay. If the past history of the Namibian question is of any relevance, this is not an easy task, but it is a long-overdue one.

59. This year, during the last few months, important events have taken place which have created a certain momentum in the stalled diplomatic and political process concerning Namibia. First, the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April, and then the timely Council meetings have provided an impetus for international action. The deliberations of the Council, culminating on 31 May with the adoption of resolution 532 (1983), have also served to highlight the special responsibility which the United Nations holds for achieving independence for Namibia—a sacred trust of the United Nations.

60. This important resolution, 532 (1983), has reaffirmed the earlier resolution of the Council, resolution 435 (1978), by which the Council adopted the plan for the independence of Namibia. South Africa, the illegal occupier of Namibia, has since then prevented the implementation of that plan in defiance and mockery of all the efforts of the international community.

61. It is on this basis that the Secretary-General, carrying out a most difficult mandate given to him under resolution 532 (1983), has conducted valuable consultations with the parties concerned with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

62. We view favourably the concise and pertinent report prepared by the Secretary-General on the results of his mission, which included a working trip to southern Africa [*S/15943*]. He has thus been able to observe the situation at close quarters and hold direct contacts. In this way he has, first of all, been able to clear away the remaining issues concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), issues left open by South Africa. Furthermore, and perhaps more important, he has been able to draw a very clear picture of the present situation regarding Namibia. This clear and accurate description of the situation will facilitate the steps which need to be taken. We are grateful to the Secretary-General for his valuable efforts. At the same time, we have taken note of the constructive attitude adopted by SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, during those consultations by declaring its readiness to accept a cease-fire at once. Thus the pre-implementation diplomatic process could be considered to be completed. Yet the negotiating process this time faces a South African pre-condition, the so-called linkage, which lies outside the scope of the peace plan envisaged by resolution 435 (1978).

63. Therefore, it still is not possible to set a date for a cease-fire and to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The further frustration of the legitimate and rightful national aspirations of the Namibian people not only places a burden on the conscience of the international community, but also is fraught with dangers for regional, as well as international, peace and security.

64. We believe that, in dealing with this critical problem, primary attention should be paid to the suffering and injustices which fall on the Namibian people as a result of the prolongation of the illegal occupation and repression by South Africa. The time has long since come for the Namibians rightfully to become masters of their own land, their own resources and their own destiny.

65. I should like to ask what the crucial difference is between Namibians and other peoples in Africa and elsewhere that, while so many peoples have attained their freedom, Namibians are being relentlessly kept under the most repressive form of colonialism. The answer seems to be that the only difference is the name of the colonial Power, South Africa.

66. Moreover, there are many indications that South Africa is reviving in Namibia its attempts to create an internal solution. It is doing so while keeping world public opinion occupied by appearing to be interested in the implementation of the internationally recognized plan for independence. There are signs of South African prevarication, entrenchment and political manipulation in Namibia, not of a preparedness for a peaceful transition to independence. As a matter of fact, if, again, the past history of Namibia is of any significance, South Africa will be likely to raise one obstacle after another on the path leading to the attainment of the fundamental rights of the people of Namibia.

67. Simultaneously, the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa more than 16 years after its Mandate was terminated by the United Nations poses a dangerous and increasing threat to peace and security in southern Africa. The stability and well-being of independent African States are being attacked constantly by the South African régime, which is bent on preserving its hold over Namibia and subjugating its neighbours to its unjust policies.

68. In these circumstances, every effort needs to be exerted to persuade South Africa to agree to the expeditious implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia. Otherwise the grave consequences of a further prolongation and aggravation of the existing situation would necessitate the taking of the urgent and decisive measures envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations.

69. In concluding, I wish to say that my Government, in conformity with its firm commitment to the struggle against all forms of colonialism and racial discrimination, fully supports and has faith in the just cause of the people of Namibia and is confident of their final victory. My Government is committed to all the efforts being expended by the United Nations to achieve the full sovereign independence and territorial integrity of Namibia. We sincerely hope that this round of meetings of the Council will lead us to that objective in the shortest possible time.

70. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): I should like first, Sir, to extend to you my friendliest compliments on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month, and my most sincere appreciation of the able and dedicated way in which you have already conducted our work, even into the early hours of one recent morning. Your country and mine have always enjoyed bilateral relations unmarred by any controversy and forged stongly over many past centuries. I am convinced that the same friendly relations will project into the indefinite future.

71. I also wish to compliment your predecessor, our good friend and colleague, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana, for so valiantly carrying the burden of the Council presidency during September.

72. We are meeting in gravely troubled times, with an unusually heavy burden of responsibility falling on the Council. Malta is anxious that no opportunity should be lost for the Council to reduce tension and to exercise its proper role in world affairs. We have even made a sincere effort to provide for this against unexpected contingencies.

73. On this particular issue of Namibia, we have already stated our position in our statement before the Council on 31 May 1983 [*2449th meeting, paras 37-56*]. In the interests of the efficient conduct of our work, we do not wish to repeat the main elements as we see them, especially since many eloquent statements, particularly those of the front-line African States and of the United Nations Council for Namibia, have already done full justice to the present phase of our discussions. So has the authentic representative of the Namibian people, the people whose unfettered future should be the sole focus of our concentrated attention today.

74. There are therefore only a few additional points I now feel compelled to make. First and foremost, I should like to express the gratitude of my delegation to the Secretary-General, not only for so efficiently carrying out the tasks assigned to him under Council resolution 532 (1983) but also for clearly stating, with commendable brevity and realistic insight, all the compelling reasons which should prompt us to move forward in our united effort to ensure the attainment of the long-desired independence of Namibia. The contents of paragraphs 24 to 29 of his report [*S/15943*] synthesize the whole story. I feel they should be taken as a whole, without any selective quotation.

75. On a bleak international horizon, the dawn of Namibian independence beckons with a constant ray of hope. That is the wish long held by the Namibian people, and also, let us never forget, by the international community as a whole, irrespective of what one member may conveniently argue to the contrary. Obviously, one more major effort is still needed after a review of the stage we have now reached.

76. My delegation has therefore listened carefully to all the participants in the debate. We are pleased by the evident progress achieved, which has been acknowledged by all. Since we are so near, even though our final objective may not yet have been attained, we must not be distracted from our main approach; nor should we allow any divisive elements to break the unity of ranks which so commendably has characterized the peaceful approach of the United Nations, in particular the Council, since the unanimous adoption of resolution 435 (1978)—five weary years ago, perhaps, but constantly nourished by hope and by steady progress.

77. The main elements that South Africa is now emphasizing, as one more unfortunate pretext for delay, are not new. They can be easily dismissed, since they were already present at the time the Council resolution was unanimously adopted, and yet no reference was made to these so-called obstacles at that time.

78. If East-West tension has unfortunately increased since then, it is not only South Africa that is feeling the consequent pernicious effects. But even so, that is no valid reason for South Africa—or any other country for that matter—to renege on its international obligations. On the contrary, it imposes an even stronger responsibility for avoidance of situations that might further exacerbate international tension.

79. I need hardly stress that one certain prescription for increasing such tension would, in fact, be generated if South Africa were to deny to the Namibian people the exercise of their right to independence. This would be detrimental not only to Namibia, but to neighbouring countries, and these of course include South Africa itself. Once more, therefore, we appeal to the Government of South Africa not to choose short-term objectives, but finally to embark on a new chapter in writing the human and political history of the southern part of the African continent by making its important contribution towards removing the last vestiges of the colonialist attitude from the region of southern Africa and promoting good-neighbourly relations.

80. We also call on the influential friends of South Africa to utilize to the fullest extent possible, and as never before, all their powerful means of persuasion in the continuing effort necessary to convince South Africa that it should allow progress to proceed unhindered, by being more

accommodating in the interests of the "sacred trust" to which it has paid so much lip-service in the past, but which, unfortunately, it has not yet upheld in practice.

81. Once more, we wish to commend SWAPO and the front-line States for their co-operative attitude, which stands in marked contrast to that of South Africa. We commend in particular the repeated readiness of SWAPO to negotiate a cease-fire.

82. Once more we commend the patience and forbearance of the Namibian people themselves, and renew to them the assurance of our modest but continued support in their peaceful quest for independence.

83. It is now fairly and squarely South Africa's long-overdue turn to show in practical terms its stated commitment to Namibian independence. It cannot deny, as regards the wishes of the Namibian people themselves, that these can best be determined by the people concerned, in a free and secret ballot on the basis of universal suffrage, rather than by any contrived and unrepresentative system superimposed by South Africa. We are convinced that any slurs against the impartiality of United Nations assistance in the exercise of Namibian self-determination is, unfortunately, but one more figment of South Africa's anachronistic phobia against genuine freedom and equality.

84. As regards our best method of approach, I continue to believe that another unanimously adopted resolution would further augment the current political impetus for tangible progress. We therefore hope that all Members—without any single exception—will contribute to that need. As I said on a previous occasion:

> "The invaluable resources of a collective and concentrated international effort, backed by the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General and his team, constitute an irresistible tide for final victory. South Africa should join, rather than impede, this final sprint." [*2449th meeting, para. 55.*]

85. A unanimously adopted resolution at this juncture would unmistakably confirm to South Africa that it stands alone, isolated in its obsolete philosophy, decades behind the real requirements of modern times. The current debate, and the resolution adopted, should leave South Africa without even a shadow of a doubt as to the real wishes of the international community and, in fact, conclusively demonstrate that South Africa's self-assumed confidence of international support is absolutely unfounded.

86. The draft resolution just introduced, which Malta has been pleased to join in sponsoring, provides the working basis for a concerted, peaceful and unanimous approach.

87. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

88. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you personally, as well as the members of the Council, for giving me this opportunity to participate in the Council's debates on the question of Namibia. Allow me also to congratulate you on your assumption of the responsible office of the President of the Council for the month of October and to express my conviction that your wealth of experience and diplomatic skill will contribute to the solution of the important tasks facing the Council.

89. I should also like to express my appreciation and my deep esteem for your predecessor, Mr. Noel Sinclair, the representative of Guyana, for the exemplary way in which he discharged his responsibilities as President of the Council for September.

90. This is the second time this year that the Council has been asked to consider the question of the continued occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria and to take steps to ensure the immediate implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations, including those of the Council itself, on the granting of independence to the Territory.

91. World public opinion, through its most competent international forums, has for years now been categorically and consistently expressing its solidarity with the people of Namibia and with their just and legitimate struggle against colonial occupation and for self-determination, liberation and national independence. The resolutions of the General Assembly, as well as all the decisions of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the OAU, invariably stress that the racists are in Namibia illegally and that they must withdraw from the Territory immediately. This position is supported by all peace-loving States.

92. During its present meetings, the Council has had another opportunity to hear statements by a large number of delegations from all geographical regions and of different shades of political opinion, who have expressed more forcefully than ever their concern at the deadlock in the efforts to grant independence to Namibia. The overwhelming majority of delegations that have already spoken in the Council's debate have clearly stated that the only path leading to a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem remains the prompt implementation of the appropriate resolutions of the United Nations, including Council resolution 435 (1978) setting forth the United Nations plan for the granting of independence to Namibia, a plan which should be implemented without any amendment or subsequent distortion and without the introduction of any extraneous element that has nothing to do with the plan. It is quite clear to all, or virtually all, those present in this hall, as well as to the overwhelming majority of world public opinion, that the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence does not depend, and cannot depend, on any external factors or interests whatsoever. Furthermore, it is also quite clear that foreign interests—those of the racists and their imperialist protectors—are directly responsible for the continued suffering of the Namibian people and the other peoples of southern Africa. My delegation considers that any reference to the so-called security interests of Pretoria expresses cynical disdain for the legitimate rights of those peoples

and constitutes open support for the colonialist and racist policy of that régime.

93. Namibia's history is one of colonial domination, genocide and racism in its most overt and extreme manifestations—that is, the policy of *apartheid*, repression, exploitation and plunder, poverty and brutal violations of fundamental human rights.

94. The people of Namibia have never resigned themselves to this situation. In recent years, the heroic struggle for self-determination and independence, under the leadership of its vanguard, SWAPO, has become a movement of national resistance against the occupiers, a struggle whose legitimacy is expressly recognized by the United Nations and the OAU. In spite of the categorically expressed will of the Namibian people to be free, and in defiance of United Nations decisions that for 17 years now have declared the end of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and called for the immediate cessation of its occupation, South Africa has continued brazenly to disregard the will of the world Organization. Namibia has been turned into a veritable military base. The 100,000 racist soldiers occupying the country are waging an aggressive colonial war against its people.

95. All the United Nations resolutions on the subject demonstrate that the persistent and firm support given to South Africa by the United States and certain other Western countries, as well as their co-operation in many fields with the racist régime, provide the necesary basis for the continuation of its inhuman policy. Strengthened by that support, Pretoria is intensively carrying out acts designed to destabilize the Governments of neighbouring sovereign African countries. Confident in its impunity, and showing once again its disdain for world public opinion, South Africa perpetrated a fresh act of banditry at the very beginning of this series of Council meetings by launching a piratical attack against the capital of Mozambique. Bulgaria firmly condemns this brutal violation of the rules of international law, which once again demonstrates just how far the policy of constructive engagement between Washington and Pretoria can go.

96. Events during the five years following the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978) have shown that South Africa and the United States Administration are pursuing a co-ordinated policy aimed at perpetuating colonial domination over Namibia, consolidating the *apartheid* régime, exercising pressure and destabilizing the Governments of the front-line States to compel them to adopt a policy to the liking of the imperialists and the racists. Washington's policy is motivated by its ambition for world supremacy, which is at the root of all its actions everywhere in the world, the most recent expression of which has been the events in Grenada.

97. The growing aggressiveness of United States policy as conducted by the present Administration can be seen clearly in its persistent attempts to impose arbitrarily a link between the question of Namibia and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Attempts to link these two questions, which have nothing in common, reflect the continued efforts of Washington and Pretoria to delay the granting of independence to Namibia and strengthen the illegal racist occupation of the Territory. Furthermore, these attempts constitute overt and flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Angola and are meant to limit its right to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and destabilize and topple its legitimate Government. There can be no doubt that the wide-ranging aggression against and the occupation of large parts of Angolan territory by South Africa are aimed at attaining the same objectives by force of arms.

98. Bulgaria resolutely condemns and categorically rejects the policy of Pretoria and Washington to link the question of the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and insists that aggression against that country and interference in its internal affairs should cease. We hope that, at this series of meetings, the Council will condemn and reject that policy. Previous debates in the Council have confirmed that to be the will of the international community.

99. The Council must also take decisive measures to guarantee the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) by setting a firm deadline for its implementation and, if that deadline is not respected, by imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

100. My country's position was reiterated during the visit to Bulgaria a few days ago of the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma. On 18 October last, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, met with Mr. Nujoma and condemned the attempts of the racists and their Western allies to impose a neo-colonial solution to the Namibian problem and stressed that Bulgaria firmly supported the position that full authority should be transferred to SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. He expressed the unfailing militant solidarity of the Bulgarian people with the just and legitimate struggle of the Namibian people and its vanguard, SWAPO.

101. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

102. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran):

> "O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is (he who is) the most righteous of you. And God has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things)."*

* Quoted in Arabic by the speaker.

Today the Council is deliberating on the problem of Namibia. Namibia is another victim of imperialism and international Zionism, whose mother base is in the United States and two of whose major satellite bases are in Palestine and South Africa. The problem of Namibia is, like that of Palestine, a perennial international problem which apparently cannot be solved by the United Nations.

103. Certain problems which fall within the scope of the Charter of the United Nations—and these are very few in number and very small in size—can be solved on the basis of the Charter and the usual methods of international parliamentary procedure. These are problems which do not question the fundamental presuppositions and axioms of the international body: routine issues of international aviation; international telecommunication matters; matters of relief assistance to drought-stricken people; relief work in the event of natural catastrophes such as earthquakes; Red Cross matters; simple border conflicts; bilateral conflicts of a certain kind—not all of them, of course; some of the issues of the International Monetary Fund—certainly not all of them; some minor local or regional economic or educational problems; these are examples of the kinds of problems that do not call into question or come into conflict with certain presuppositions of the international body and which can very happily be solved by the United Nations.

104. However, there are certain international issues which both precede and go beyond the Charter and its presuppositions, not only historically speaking, but also theoretically and structurally. The problem of nationalism, for instance, is beyond the scope of United Nations problem-solving machinery, because instead of the United Nations encompassing it, it encompasses the United Nations. The United Nations is based on the concept of nationalism; the nation-State concept of political entities is axiomatic in the very structure of the United Nations and its Charter. That Charter, therefore, cannot provide for that problem and is not equal to it.

105. Other issues are imperialism and international Zionism, which are essentially beyond the scope of the United Nations problem-solving tradition. The United Nations is as wretched a victim of imperialism and international Zionism as is Namibia itself. That is why the problems of South Africa and Israel remain perennially untouched issues in the context of United Nations diplomacy; and whenever they are brought up here, in a sort of innocent, naïve and emotional manner, they are wrongly introduced as the problems of Namibia and Palestine. This is because people, or at least some people, want to sympathize with, pat, patronize and pacify the victims without touching the criminals, or because they want to deceive themselves by dealing with the façade, the surface effect, and not with the cause.

106. The poor United Nations and its miserable Charter—to which some hypocrites refer as if it were a divine code—are too small to solve the problems of imperialism, international Zionism, racism, communism and materialism, and their immediate by-products, such as the problem of the Middle East, including Palestine, the problem of Afghanistan, the problem of South Africa, the problem of Nicaragua and other similar problems.

107. The problem of South Africa is not basically different from the problems of Zambia, Ghana, Namibia, Tanzania, or the whole of Africa. But when that problem comes to the United Nations it becomes isolated from the rest of its body and remains a perennial issue, like that of Zionism and the Zionist base in the Middle East. These problems—whether the Organization's procedures and Charter admit it or not—are slightly bigger than the ball-game of the United Nations, and they must be considered in a broader context, which goes far beyond the United Nations and those presuppositions which are axiomatic in the entire international body.

108. The genius of the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement was that they realized full well that certain problems unquestionally fall beyond the scope of the United Nations system and cannot be solved within it. But, unfortunately, being themselves professional statesmen and politicians interested in quick solutions, they started the Movement on a practical basis and were unable to open a theoretical front to meet the challenge of meta–United Nations issues. Thus, they failed to realize that when many more United Nations Members, with their own preoccupations and propensities, joined the Non-Aligned Movement in order to make it more universal, they would metamorphose the entire Movement into a body like the United Nations, either parallel or similar to the United Nations, and maybe subservient to it, but anyway always beneath it. That is why in all other international bodies, such as the Non-Aligned Movement, the OAU and the organizations of Latin American countries, everybody makes sure that nothing goes against the Charter, the rules of procedure or the resolutions of the United Nations. Even in the Organization of the Islamic Conference—which is supposed to be Islamic—if something contrary to the Charter or the resolutions of the United Nations comes about, everybody becomes hysterical.

109. Thus, in all those international bodies, which are in fact independent of the United Nations and are supposed to be forums for consideration of meta–United Nations issues, we cannot do very much, because all those bodies have, willy-nilly, become like sub-committees of the United Nations. They deal with exactly the same issues, use the same methods and paperwork, and have the same resolution-type ends and objectives.

110. Even the United Nations ritual "At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I have to congratulate you", is carefully preserved, and the recital of a verse from the Holy Koran, which is common practice in all Islamic gatherings, is sometimes ignorantly forgotten in our Islamic Conference meetings.

111. We have all of us therefore deprived ourselves of an arena in which meta–United Nations issues, like that of Namibia, could be resolved in an entirely different, more comprehensive and more encompassing context. Whenever we bring those issues to the United Nations, without

knowing whether a given issue really falls within or without the scope of United Nations diplomacy, we find ourselves in a deadlock. The result can be nothing but deadlock, because we want to take political actions against a Member which, according to the Bible of the United Nations, has every right to veto our decisions. At this stage let us forget about the bilateral relations that exist among the holders of the veto power and some of the victim countries and the impact those relations have upon United Nations diplomacy. I simply mean, let us at this stage condone and overlook many other things.

112. Under such circumstances we want to solve the problem of Namibia here, and that problem inevitably dissolves into the silly and irrelevant argument that if the Cubans leave Angola then the United States will smile and will treat the Angolans more kindly by pretending to oppose some of the *apartheid* policies of South Africa. We press—the Council presses—for resolutions and the United States simply vetoes them. United States imperialism is a gigantic mountain, and the diplomatic pressures exerted on it here are like the soft, beautiful spring rainfall. The diplomats of the United Nations who want to break down United States imperialism with resolutions seem like soft-hearted, innocent and primitive people looking forward to the total erosion of that mountain by the annual spring rain. Do you know how many years you will have to wait? The answer is: for a complete geological period, through only three of which we have passed since the creation of the earth—and we have not yet completed the fourth.

113. Some small, soft hills and hill-tops can be washed away naturally or manually by water, but some need dynamite, not United Nations resolutions. We in the Islamic Republic of Iran have found our forum, its charters and its correct international perspectives in the Holy Koran. We think that others also need a theoretical or ideological frame of reference; they too need a charter and a different cosmological—and thus international—perspective, armed with which they can seriously challenge and eradicate imperialism, materialism, Zionism and other international meta-United Nations complexities. We have also come to the conclusion that communism and other leftist trends and pseudo-ideologies are, essentially, as materialistic as capitalism and that they cannot solve the problems of mankind. Instead, they themselves add to the problems that are already in hand.

114. Our foreign policy of leaning neither to the East nor to the West is not, therefore, an emotional position taken in anger towards either the Russians or Americans. Its basis is not animosity against Westerners or Easterners, nor does it stem from such animosity. Rather, for us it is a new approach to solving many human problems, only some of them meta-United Nations issues, and we regret that we have not yet been properly understood.

115. Let us go back to the problem of Namibia. The problem of Namibia cannot be resolved without an honest and sincere understanding of its components, namely, United States imperialism and imperialist interest in Africa, and the presence of natural resources and some rare and expensive radioactive metals, such as uranium, copper, oil, precious stones and other valuable substances for which arrogant Powers are killing the local people, in the first instance, and ultimately themselves, if necessary. The East seems to have the upper hand in this struggle, because it begins with some sort of ideology—good or bad—which it gives to the people. However, the West has no ideology to offer. It goes therefore not to the people but to Governments. And since Governments are usually supposed to represent the people, those who work with the people and on the people thus have an advantage. If the American Administration is honest in its belief in democracy, then the people of Angola and elsewhere in Africa have every right to be friendly with any country they like and to follow any ideology they like. They have every right to tolerate or befriend any other country and then to decide how bad or good a given ideology may be and, like other people in other parts of the world, to fight against those ideologies if they wish to do so. But they must have the right to choose.

116. However, all the good things in Africa are too seductive to be easily overlooked by multinational corporations and their Governments. Those Governments therefore resort to very nasty practices through multinational groups and Zionist agents in South Africa and in Palestine. The same multinational companies determine the nature and Government policies of Western Administrations that have veto rights here, and have allies and other satellites in addition to their main and secondary puppets in the United Nations. Now, we bring up Namibia here, not from the viewpoint of what the oppressed people of Namibia and the *apartheid*-stricken people of South Africa really need, but from the viewpoint of instructions from well-known Governments.

117. I should therefore like to address all the representatives here, and particularly those from Africa, not as diplomats but as ordinary, honest people who understand all the dimensions of the issue. If they have any concern for the people of South Africa, I urge them to report the situation back to their Foreign Offices in such a way as to persuade them not to see the situation as an ordinary international issue but rather as a meta-United Nations issue that can be resolved only through the united collaboration of African countries, standing independent of all affiliations and leanings towards either West or East. If those countries can have an independent OAU, different from the United Nations and ready to transcend the artificial, silly, nationalistic identities and boundaries of Africa that are now ossified and fortified on that continent, then they can do something for Namibia and for the rest of Africa. Otherwise they cannot do very much. Thus the solution to the problem of the people in the southern part of Africa, as well as in the rest of Africa, inevitably lies in the hands of those revolutionary groups that are struggling to break down the existing political structure that is now subjugating them.

118. As for the arrogant Power—and, particularly, as for Western arrogance—if they honestly do not want bloodshed and human suffering, they have to make concessions—some concessions, at least the minimum that the United Nations resolutions suggest.

119. But our ultimate solution in Iran is simply Islamic; it stems from the verse in the Holy Koran which I quoted at the beginning of my statement and which means something very simply. It means: Believe in God, surrender to His will and His commandments as they are in the Holy Koran. Do not fear anyone but Him. Obey no one save Him. And there you are all free and equal; the nearest of you to God is the most righteous of you.

120. I regret that I cannot see the international body as being anything but very remote from that solution.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 28th meeting*, para. 51.

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

[3] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 24*, part two, chap. II, sect. B.

[4] *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF. 120/13), annex IV, sect. A. 4.

[5] XLIX: 13.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—June 1992—2,050